

IBN ARABI'S THEORY OF THE PERFECT MAN AND ITS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF ISLAMIC

INTRODUCTION

Ibn 'Arabi (-) is without doubt the most important and the most influential thinker in later Islamic intellectual history. His mystical philosophy, later labeled the doctrine of "unity of existence" (wahdat al-wujUd,) dominated all the cultural spheres of the later Muslim world. His influence is so penetrating that it is impossible to understand the history of Islamic thought after the thirteenth century without a good understanding of Ibn 'Arabi. Especially in the Sunni world, where rational theology (kalam) suffered gradual ossification and "Hellenistic" philosophy (falsafa) disappeared, it is not an exaggeration to say that Ibn 'Arabi's thought became the only theology and

philosophy. Also in Shi c ite Iran, where theology and philosophy continued to be cultivated, the influence of Ibn 'Arabi is conspicuous. His thought has been firmly integrated into Sh c ite theology since Haydar Amull and Ibn Abi Jumhur, and also it is one of the main sources of Shi c ite philosophical tradition as represented by Mulla Sadra. Even the field of poetry, traditionally the most beloved form of expression of Sufism, could not escape Ibn 'Arabi's prevailing influence. Not only did many Sufi poets versify his philosophy, but also the poems of the great masters of Sufism, Ibn Farid and Jalal al-Din Rumi, were interpreted by later commentators according to the philosophy of Ibn 'Arabi.

In addition to being an important and influential thinker, Ibn 'Arabi has been considered the most difficult thinker Islam ever produced. His thought remains ever enigmatic in spite of the multitude of studies produced by generations of Muslim and Western scholars devoted to elucidating his thought. The efforts to find a coherent system in his enormous body of works started already with §adr al-Din al-Qun-

awl, his most able disciple. Here I shall review important works on Ibn 'Arabi in Western languages. The two pioneering works were written by the prominent scholars, H. S. Nyberg and M. Asin Palacios. The former edited three short but important treatises of Ibn 'Arabi in his *Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-'-Arabi* and attached a valuable and illuminating introduction to it. The latter, in the *Islam cristianizado* gave a full and detailed account of Ibn 'Arabi's life, and a summary of his mystico-ethical thought. Both scholars, with their vast learning, tried to trace the origins of Ibn 'Arabi's thought in various traditions of pre-Islamic and Islamic thought. Nyberg's work still remains the best comparative study of Ibn 'Arabi's philosophy. Strangely enough, however, neither scholar paid due attention to the most mature work of Ibn 'Arabi, the *Fusus al-Hikam*. Furthermore, Nyberg, while limiting his scope to the elucidation of the three treatises he edited, made little use of *al-Futuhat al-Makkhya*. Asin Palacios, on the other hand, curiously avoided any analysis of Ibn 'Arabi's metaphysics in his book.

R. A. Nicholson, a profound scholar in the field of Islamic mysticism, summarized in a masterly manner the metaphysical system of the *wahdat al-wujud* of Jili in his *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, however, he gave only a brief and preliminary study of Ibn 'Arabi's *Fusus al-Hikam*. His student, A. E. Affifi, who edited and commented upon the *Fusus al-Hikam*, provided a clear and systematical account of Ibn 'Arabi's entire thought in *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Din Ibnul *Arabi*, a work based mainly on the *Fusus al-Hikam* and *al-Futuhat al-Makkiya*. Although his book is still the best general introduction to Ibn 'Arabi, it suffers from over-systematization; also the comparative study between Ibn 'Arabi and the preceding Pre-Islamic and Islamic thinkers, among whom he attempted to find Ibn 'Arabi's sources, remains too sketchy and superficial.

More recently, H. Corbin's *L'imagination crbatrice dans le soufisme d'Ibn 'Arabi* and T. Izutsu's *Sufism and Taoism* have been the most significant contributions to Ibn 'Arabi studies. Corbin, mainly interested in Iranian metaphysical tradition (particularly in the works of Suhrawardi,) discovered the heritage of Ibn 'Arabi assimilated in this

tradition. Although Ibn 'Arabi himself does not belong to Iranian tradition, his similarity to it struck Corbin, and prompted him to study the Shaykh al-Akbar. Corbin's book is full of deep insights and interesting and stimulating observations. However, his approach through phenomenology and Jungian psychology is fundamentally ahistorical; therefore, it is no wonder that the consideration of the historical background of Ibn 'Arabi's thought is totally missing in his book. T.

Izutsu, however, who is close to Corbin in his methodology and interest, stoically limited his study to the thorough analysis of the *Fusus al-Hikam*. In its depth of textual interpretation, his book surpasses all the previous works, but he avoids using any other works of Ibn 'Arabi, nor does he try to locate Ibn 'Arabi in the history of Islamic thought.

On the whole, it can be said that few studies have been done hitherto to evaluate Ibn 'Arabi's thought in relation to early Islamic intellectual traditions. Therefore, while I limit myself to one of Ibn 'Arabi's most celebrated theories, that is, the theory of the Perfect Man, I try to examine Ibn 'Arabi's thought in historical perspective. Although he is in many ways an original figure in the intellectual history of Islam, his thought is, nevertheless, firmly rooted in Islamic traditions. Otherwise he would never have been so widely and enthusiastically accepted by later Sufis. Furthermore, his originality can be properly appreciated only in comparison with the heritage he freely made use of, especially that of early Sufism.

One of the reasons of Ibn 'Arabi's difficulty for students of his thought is his elusive style. He is neither a systematic writer like Ghazzali, who presents his arguments in a well-arranged order, nor a text-book writer like Qushayrl and Kalabadhi. As a true mystic, he writes under inspiration, and ideas upon ideas gush out from his pen like water from a spring. The simple systematization of such a work does not do full justice to him. Once it is systematized, it loses its dynamics and becomes a static scholastic mysticism. On the other hand,

the difficulty he poses is essentially different from that of early mystics like Hallaj. In Hallaj, every passage, every sentence is enigmatic. His words are, in reality, ecstatic utterances (shathlyat) which can be only understood experientially, while in Ibn 'Arabi each passage is, in most cases, clear enough, once one is accustomed to his technical terms. One can find in every passage an original and interesting idea, or a surprising interpretation of the Qur'an, the hadlth, theological doctrines, or sayings of early Sufi masters. Nevertheless, as a whole, he manages to remain as obscure as ever. It is because his arguments proceed mainly through association, not through logical structure. In this sense, his writings can be compared to the Persian ghazali, whose verse (bayt) is like a beautiful pearl. Each one, however, is generally regarded as being loosely strung together with a thread of association. For instance, in the Fusus al-Hikam, Ibn 'Arabi argues that every saint receives esoterical knowledge from the seal of the saints; therefore, messengers qua saints receive it from this seal, although the latter must follow the Law brought by the former. Thus, the seal is lower than messengers in one aspect and higher in another. His argument so far is very clear. However, he tries to explain the point in the following manner:

What we have maintained here is supported by what appeared in our sharl c a, i.e., the superiority of c Umar's judgement [over the Prophet and Abu Bakr] in respect of the prisoners taken at Badr, and the matter of the pollination of palms. It is not necessary for one who is perfect to be superior in everything and at every level. Men [i.e., sufis] regarded only the superiority in the degrees of knowledge of God. This is their [sole] object of desire. As for phenomenal things, their minds are not concerned with them .

The above passage, when it is regarded independently from the context, is clear, but how does it explain the previous point? In order to explain the *prima facie* audacious statement that the seal is higher than messengers in one aspect, Ibn 'Arabi gives us two examples in which the Prophet made inferior judgements as compared to those who were not prophets. In the latter example of the pollination of palms, the

Prophet tells some palm cultivators that they are more knowledgeable in worldly affairs (than he is.) This saying of the Prophet prompts Ibn 'Arabi to make an interesting remark on the meaning of perfection in knowledge. The remark is pertinent as an interpretation of the hadlth, but impertinent in the whole context, because the esoteric knowledge which messengers receive from the seal is exactly concerned with God, not with phenomenal things.

In view of these characteristics of Ibn 'Arabi's thought, an analysis of recurring motifs in his vast body of writings would be most useful.. In the history of Medieval philosophy, this method of motif analysis is applied in a masterly manner by Alexander Altmann in "The Delphic Maxim in Medieval Islam and Judaism ." although his main interest is in Jewish philosophy. .In the present study, I choose three predominant motifs used by Ibn *-Arabi in his discussion of the Perfect Man; Adam created in the image of God; the correspondences of the microcosm and the macrocosm; and the motif of Sufi saints as the supreme example of the Perfect Man in contrast with the Animal Man. Each motif has a long history in Pre-Islamic and Islamic thought. However, in this study, we have limited ourselves to the most repesentative treatments of these motifs in Islamic thought, except for the first motif of Adam created in the image of God, in which the Judeo-Christian background is obvious and cannot be neglected.

CHAPTER I

THEOLOGY OF THE IMAGE OF GOD

Ibn 'Arabi's philosophy of man is characterized by the concept of the "Perfect Man" symbolized by Adam, whom God created in His image as

His vicegerent on.earth. The predominant feature of his anthropology is anthropocentrism founded on ontology. He uses the themes and motives familiar to early Sufism. Indeed, anthropocentrism itself is nothing

new not only in Islam, but also in the Judeo-Christian tradition. However, Ibn 'Arabi provided anthropocentrism with a philosophical basis, and reinterpreted old Biblical and Qur'anic motives through this metaphysics, and gave new meanings to these age-old motives. Curiously enough, his anthropology shows striking similarities to that of the early Christian fathers, who also interpreted Biblical myths through Hellenistic philosophy and offered the Christian belief a philosophical foundation. In this chapter, we first examine the Pre-Islamic background of anthropocentrism and the theology of the image developed in Judeo-Christian traditions, then we discuss the theology of the image in early Sufism before Ibn 'Arabi, namely Hallaj, and Ruzbihan Baql Shiraz!, who used Hallajian sources and developed his idea, and Ghazzali, who is closest to Ibn 'Arabi, among the earlier Sufis in respect of the theology of the image.

Pre-Islamic Tradition The Old Testament

Anthropocentrism is clearly stated in the Old Testament, namely in the Genesis. All creatures are created for the sake of man; man is given dominion over all creatures. The fact that man is the ultimate aim of God's creation is further strengthened by the statement that God created Adam in His image. The meaning of this statement has puzzled generations of theologians both in Judaism and Christianity, and numerous explanations have been offered. Edmund Schlink sums up the problematics surrounding the *Imago Dei* motif in the following way.

- . In what lies the commonness of the image?
- . Who has the commonness of the image? and who is the image of God ?

In the context of the Old Testament, the answer to the first question remains obscure. The correspondences between man and God are never explicitly stated. Rather, the distance between the creature and the Creator remains in the foreground. As for the second question, it is

generally agreed that Adam here symbolizes man in general, and the commonness of the image remains true even after the fall of Adam.

In later Judaism, there appeared the ethico-anthropological interpretation of the motif. According to individual conduct and the degree of his conformity with the Law, man either preserves or loses the commonness of the image. To have the same image with God means to become worthy of His image. But it should be noted that at this stage there is no dualism of the body and soul. This radical dualism is first introduced into Judeo-Christian tradition by Gnosticism with its famous Anthropos myth.

Gnosticism

Gnosticism introduced several important ideas for the interpretation of the *Imago Dei* motif. Here we enumerate these ideas, following Schwanz's analysis.

- . The concept of the image is applied to the divine being, which is distinguished from the absolute Godhead. This divine being, which is called Anthropos, Sophia, or Logos, is characterized as the Image of God.
- . The concept of the image expresses both sameness and difference from the absolute Godhead. The relation between them is explained through the Neo-Platonic emanation theory.
- . The theory of revelation and soteriology are bound with the concept of the image. The revelation is to know that the inner part of man, man's self, has the divine origin, and by this knowledge man can achieve salvation.
- . The soul and the body are clearly divided. The latter belongs to the physical universe. It is a prison for the former. The physical universe is created by the evil Demiurgos, and it is evil. The soul comes from God, but it is not in the true sense of the word created, rather it emanates from God.

. The term "image" is sometimes applied to the inner part of man. Thus this term has at the same time the meaning of the model and the copy.

We can schematize the Gnostic theory of the image in the following way :

God----- Image of God----- Man

Philo of Alexandria

Among the pre-Islamic interpretations of the *Imago Dei* motif, that of Philo is the most interesting and influential. Wolfson considers him the founder of all the later medieval religious philosophies in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Although his importance is over-exaggerated, there is no doubt that his theory of the image in his exegesis of the *Genesis* influenced many Patristic philosophers such as Origen and Gregory of Nyssa. The philosophy of Philo is labeled sometimes as Middle

Platonism, sometimes as Stoicism. There is a certain similarity between him and Gnosticism, especially in respect of the doctrine of the image.

Philo's speculation on the image of God starts with the distinction between man created in the image of God and man formed from the clay, based on the two different descriptions of the creation in the *Genesis*. The former, who is called the divine man (*anthropos theou*) is interpreted in two ways. First it is the human intelligence which guides the soul and governs the body like God. Secondly it is stated that the man created in the image of God is an idea, genus, or seal (*sphragis*), intelligible, incorporeal, neither male nor female, incorruptible by nature. He is the heavenly Adam as compared to the earthly Adam formed from the earth.

Further, Philo connects the concept of the image with his famous

Logos doctrine. However, the precise relation of the Logos to the heavenly Adam is also ambiguous. In one place, he is identified with the Logos. In other places, the Logos is the image of God, and the ideal man (the heavenly Adam) is the image of the Logos, that is, the image of the image of God.

It is strange that, when Philo identified the heavenly Adam with the Logos, he did not think that the earthly Adam was created according to the Logos, i.e., the image of God. In Philo, the earthly man is always thought to be formed from the clay; the human intellect is created in the image of God, but man as such is never thought to be created in His image. Also it is noteworthy that in some places Philo states that the universe is created in the image of the Logos, that is, it is the image of the image of God .

Another contribution of Philo to the later anthropology is his clear formulation of the double nature of man. It is the earthly man whom he refers to as the possessor of the double nature.

The formation of the individual man, the object of sense, is a composite one made up of earthly substance and of Divine breath: for it says that the body was made through the Artificer taking clay and moulding out of it a human form, but that the soul was originated from nothing created whatever, but from the Father and Ruler of all; for that which He breathed in was nothing else than a Divine breath . . . Hence it may with propriety be said that man is the borderland (methorios) between mortal and immortal nature, partaking of each so far as is needful, and that he was created at once mortal and immortal, mortal in respect of the body, but in respect of the thought (dianoia) immortal .

Early Christianity

The theology of the image in early Christianity was greatly influenced both by Gnosticism and Philo. But the important difference lies in Christology, which early Christian fathers incorporated into their theology.

According to St. Paul, the image of God is primarily Christ, and the homo imago Dei means that Christ is the archetype of man . Although man possesses the image of God potentially, this commonness of the image is only actualized through Christ. Thus the ethico-religious character comes to the foreground. Only the new man, the inner man who is reborn in Christ, can be, in reality, called the image of God. Here the term "image" is applied both to the Christ (model) and man (copy.)

In the time of St. Paul, the Christian Logos doctrine had not yet been established. It is the early fathers who integrated the Logos doctrine into the theology of the image. Among them Irenaeus is considered the founder of the theology of the image. According to him, although Adam was created in the image of God, he lost this sameness of the image when he sinned and was expelled from Paradise. It is only through Christ, the Logos, the image of God par excellence , that man can regain the original sameness of the image. Here the soteriological aspect is predominant.

Here it is not the place to examine each Christian father who contributed to the development of the theology of the image, such as Origen, ls Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa. Therefore we summarize the following characteristics in their theory of the image:

- . God and His image are clearly distinguished. The former is the Father, and the latter Christ, the Logos.
- . Man is created in the Image, therefore he is not the image of God, rather he is the image of the image of God.
- . Like Philo, they emphasize the double nature of man. The inner man, or new man of St. Paul, is identified as the human soul, which is created in His image, while the body is formed from the earth. Discussing the doubleness of man in Gregory of Nazianzus,

Anna-Stina Ellverson writes as follows:

... man is formed of dust and spirit. He is a bit of earth to which the soul, an inbreathing of God, is joined ... He is visible and invisible, earthly and heavenly, mortal and immortal, low and high. We find Gregory underlining the doubleness of man by way of contrast. Thanks to this doubleness man further might be said to belong to two different worlds or spheres, the material as well as the spiritual and heavenly. "I am small and great, lowly and high, mortal and immortal, earthly and heavenly. The one condition I share with this world below, the other with God, the one with flesh, the other with the spirit."

. According to Origen, the commonness of the image means the cosubstantiality of all the intellects with God, because they perceive the same intelligibles. Thus the commonness of knowledge and the object of knowledge is the basis of the commonness of the image.

. The image of God is also considered as a source of knowledge. Thanks to the sameness of the image, man's self-knowledge leads to the knowledge of God. Henri Crouzel explains this theory in Origen as follows:

"Puisque 'intelligence est une image intellectuelle de Dieu, par elle on peut connaitre quelque chose de la nature de la divinite.' Il suffit pour cela que 'esprit se regarde lui-même et y constate le "desir de piete et de communion avec Dieu."

In this way, the Delphic maxim, "know yourself!" is combined with the theology of the image.

The Homo Imago Dei Motif in Sufism

The hadith, "God created Adam in His image," appears in some variants in hadith collections. The apparent anthropomorphic connotation

of this hadlth provoked some controversies, and theologians made efforts to explain away the hadlth by interpreting the third person pronoun of "his image" as someone other than God. Also this hadlth is used by Sufis for the affirmation of the close affinity existing between God and man. The reason why this hadlth had been so much discussed by theologians and Sufis was not merely that it hints at anthropomorphism. There are clearer anthropomorphic sayings in the Qur'an

such as "The hand of God" and "The face of God." Also there are anthropomorphic hadlths, such as "I saw God in the most beautiful shape . . .

. , But the true reason of the popularity of this hadlth seems to be the introduction of the theology of the image so prevalent in early Christianity into Islam. When this hadlth was introduced into Islam from the Old Testament, it was more plausible to think that the whole tradition of the interpretation of this verse entered Islam. Indeed, the Christian influence concerning the *imago Dei* motif can be clearly seen in the interpretation of some of the extreme Shi c a sects, in which Adam is said to be created by Christ in his (Christ's) image .

In any case, anthropocentrism, which is the background of this motif, is not lacking in Islam from the beginning. In the Qur'an it is stated that man is given the dominion over all things which exist in the heaven and on earth, and God created Adam as the vicegerent of God on earth and He taught him all the names, and ordered angels to prostrate to Adam. These Qur'anic verses are frequently quoted by Sufis to explain the *imago Dei* hadlth.

The most remarkable explanation of this hadlth in early Sufism is that of Shibli, reported by Ghazzall in the *Imla f'* According to Shibli, Adam was created according to God's Names and Attributes, not according to His Essence. This is a new Islamic development in the history of the theology of the image, and it is to become the most dominant interpretation in Sufism. The distinction between the Essence and the Names or Attributes is taken from Islamic theology. The Names and

Attributes occupy that intermediate position between the absolute Godhead and the creature, corresponding to the Logos of Philo and the Christian fathers.

As an example of the early speculation on the *imago Dei* motif in Sufism, we first examine the theory of Hallaj. Then Ruzbihan Baqli Shirazi is discussed as a successor of Hallajian Sufism. Then, Ghazzalx's interpretation of the *imago Dei* hadlth is treated in detail.

Hallaj

Affifi already pointed out that Hallaj's thought influenced Ibn 'Arabi greatly, and enumerated nine points of similarity between them. However, as Affifi himself admits, Hallaj belongs to a different class of mystics from that to which Ibn 'Arabi belongs. And most of the similarities which Affifi mentions are not necessarily from Hallaj. For instance, the ideas of the phenomenal world as a veil of the Real or the unknowability of God or the esoteric interpretation of the Qur'an can be found in many Sufi circles and some of the theological schools. Here I would like to concentrate on Hallaj's theory of Adam as created in His image.

Louis Massignon in his magnum opus. *La Passion de Hallaj*, spends six pages on a section entitled *Vimage de Dieu*. After having treated the origin of the *imago Dei* hadith in its two versions, "in His image," and "in the image of the Merciful One," he discusses the various schools of interpretation, and includes Hallaj among those theologians who accepted only the first version and interpreted "his" as referring to Adam; "a son image-selon la forme meme qu'Il avait preparee pour lui . . . Le type de cette image est done en Dieu comme une pure forme intelligible, une et simple, intelligible, a la fois, pour Lui." Massignon uses in this point the quotation from Hallaj in Sulami's *Tafsir*. Here the *imago Dei* hadith is quoted and explained as follows: "i.e., in his image in which God formed (sawwara) him, and the best is his image."

However, the concept of the heavenly Adam and the correspondences between man and God are not lacking in Hallaj, although he does not find these doctrines on the *imago Dei* hadith. He distinguishes two aspects in God: *lahut*, the transcendent, unattainable Godhead which makes atoms subsist, and *nasut*, the deified humanity. *Nasut* is the form assumed by the divine word before the creation: It is the clothes (*kiswa*) of the eternal witness (*shahid al-qidam*) who pledged the covenant. Thus, Adam symbolizes the *nasut* of God, or the Godhead in the clothes of humanity, especially in the event of the Covenant, and is also related to the eschatological figure of Jesus at the Last Judgement. However, the relation between this "heavenly Adam," i.e., the *nasut* of God, and the earthly man, is not clear in Hallaj.

Also Hallaj's theory of *huwa huwa* (identity, sameness) suggests the supreme identification between man and God. This theory is preserved in the words of Daylami and Ruzbihan Baqill Shirazi (the former in Arabic, the latter in Arabic and Persian.) This is not the place to examine this mystical expose of Hallaj in detail. Only the brief summary will be given here. The first part treats the relation between God's Essence and His Attributes in a highly mythopoetic language. The underlying thought is that before the creation and in His , aspect of Absoluteness, Attributes are neither separate from His Essence nor identical with it [the doctrine of the Ashcarites.] He knows his Attributes by knowing and looking at Himself. Each Attribute contains all the other Attributes. God relates to each Attribute and to the meaning of each Attribute by relating to Himself. Among these Attributes,, that of Love is most prominent. (This is characteristically Hallajian.) Finally God wishes to manifest His Attributes separately outside Himself.

Then God wanted to make these Attributes appear [starting] from Love in separateness (*infirad*,) so that He could see them and speak to them. He looked at pre-eternity and created an image, which is His image and His Essence, because if God looks at a thing. He makes in it an image from Him, and that image will remain through eternity, and in that image will

remain Knowledge, Power, Movement, Will and all [His] Attributes through eternity. When He manifests Himself eternally to a person (shakhs,) He becomes identical (huwa huwa) with him, and He looked at that [person] for an aeon (dahr) of His eternity ... He specified him with the attributes similar to those of His own action, attributes which He created from the meaning of manifestation (zuhir) in that person whom He had created in His own image. Thus he [that person] became a creator (khaliq) and a nourisher (raziq .) He praised and glorified, and made the attributes and actions visible. In the like manner, he made substances and wonders visible and [God] brought him into His kingdom, and manifested Himself in him and from him.

Although it is difficult to translate Hallaj's mythopoetical language into systematical clear philosophical language, at least the following points can be remarked.

- . Although he uses expressions such as "creation" (ibda') or "manifestation" (zuhir) of "image" and "person," he does not mention either Adam or man explicitly. "Image" or "person" can be well interpreted as "intellect" or "spirit."
- . "Existence in concreto" is not mentioned at all. Because there is no ontology, there is no distinction between the intelligible world and the physical universe, which is so common in Neo-Platonism. Therefore, we cannot surely attribute concrete existence to the image or person.
- . The Divine Essence and the image are not clearly distinguished. The image which God manifests is called both the image of God and the Essence of God. In the Judeo-Christian theology of the image, the image of God is an entity which is clearly distinguished from the Godhead, i.e., the Essence of God.

Ruzbihan Baqll Shlrazi is a Persian Sufi of the later twelfth century. He belongs to the tradition of love mystics, whom Corbin called the "fideles d'amour." His book, Sharbri Shathiyat is famous for preserving the writings and sayings of Hallaj and interpreting Hallaj's often enigmatic thought. Therefore it is very helpful to examine his interpretation on the above exposé of Hallaj. In his commentary, "the person" is explicitly identified as Adam, and the *imago Dei* hadith is appropriately quoted.

The amazing gnostic [Hallaj] says, 'He manifested Himself to a person, and became identical with him.' It means that God created Adam and dressed his creature with the clothes (kiswat) of love (khullat) of creation. 'God created Adam in His own image.' [Hallaj says,] 'He looks at him for an aeon of His eternity,' so that He manifest Himself (tajalli konad) in him with His Essence and all His Attributes. 'He taught Adam all the names.' [/.] [Hallaj says,] 'He specifies him with the attributes similar to those Attributes [of Him,]' i.e., characteristics (nu c ut) and attribute'], so that the light of His Essence appear in him, and so that He can make him perfect with all Attributes of His eternity. When he [this person, i.e., Adam] is endowed (mutamakkin) with the Might of God and His Majesty, he will possess all the Attributes of God. Through him, [God] manifests Himself to His creatures with all His Attributes, so that he becomes the vicegerent of His kingdom and the model (sunna) of the guidance of His creation.

But this is not the only place where Ruzbihan Baqll quotes the *imago Dei* hadith in his interpretation of the sayings of Hallaj.

The second occurrence is in the commentary of the following sayings of Hallaj.

The visible world (mulk) and the invisible world (malakut) are manifest (payda) in the form of Adam and his descendants.

He manifested Himself through His actions (sana'i c) and His names, when His sovereignty (subuhat) descended through the appearance of the visible world in (nazd) the Majestic Qur'an, for Power and Good Attributes (hasanat) are His.

In the above quotation, the macrocosm-microcosm motif is hinted at.

Ruzbihan Baqli's comment is as follows:

The two modes of creation from the Throne to the earth are manifest in the form of Adam, because he is a microcosm (kawn asghar.) Whoever sees Adam has seen [everything] from the Throne to the earth. "We will show them our signs in the horizons and in their souls," [/.] Through action (fi c l)

He manifested Himself into non-existence (bi-'adam.) The universe appeared with all that exists in it of actions (sana'i c .) He manifested Himself from Eternity through action (fi c l.) He made Adam appear with all [His] attributes. Concerning this, Muhammad said, 'God created Adam in His image,' that is in the image of the world (kawn,) which issued from the action. And this happened when the visible world (c alam~i mulk) and majestic witness (shahadat-i kubra) appeared.

In the above interpretation, Ruzbihan Baqll indicates that Adam was created in the image of the universe, thus he connects the *imago Dei* hadlth with the macrocosm-microcosm motif.

Besides these comments on the sayings of Hallaj, Rubzbihan Baqll often quotes the *imago Dei* hadlth in his book Sharh-eShathlyat.

As compared to Ghazzall, Ruzbihan Baqli's handling of this hadlth lacks metaphysical and theological speculations, and represents the tradition of early Sufism more faithfully.

First of all, this hadlth is treated as one of the shathlyat (ecstatic utterances) of the Prophet Muhammad together with the hadlth, "I saw my Lord in the most beautiful shape." His comments on these hadlth, are as follows:

As for the meaning of the hadlth, "God created Adam in His image," it is a piece of information concerning the manifestation (tajalll) of the essence of [divine] unity (c ayn-i-jam c) upon the essence of separation ('ayn~i tafriqa,) so that the lover be shaped with the attributes of the beloved. God manifested Himself to Adam through all His attributes; He brought out Adam [into existence] in the manner of the manifestation of all His attributes; He then manifested Himself from the mystery of his Essence upon his [Adam's] soul. Love appeared upon Adam as the attributes of Love [not as its essence.] God in His love made transcendence of His timeless attribute the primordial time for the sake of Adam . And He dressed him [Adam] in his particular time with the mystery of His Essence in the sphere of His transcendence, so that from Eternity, he [Adam] became homochrome (hamrang) with Eternity. He [Adam] was eternal, not non-existence. He was [in reality] God, not Adam. And the hadlth, "I saw my Lord [in the most beautiful shape,]" [means that] God adorned [His] action with Eternity.

The Light of His Essence was dressed with the Light of His Attributes. Then His Essence manifested Itself in His action, and His action became His Essence. He showed Himself to Muhammad as Muhammad. Muhammad was His ornament. To own an attribute in His primordial state is not an unknown design to God. No substance of creation exists without the manifestation (tajalll) of primordial eternity. If you know that everything is He, the Eternal does not become the temporal, but He shows His shape in whichever way He wishes. He shows His eternal beauty to the lover in the mirror of His action, so that He makes his [i.e., lover's] existence in its entirety turn to [His attribute of] Love. This [i.e., to turn one's entire existence to Love] is the proper behavior (sunnat) for

the lover toward the lover .

The starting point of Ruzbihan Baqill is the affirmation of both transcendence and immanence of God at the same time. The former is expressed as "absolute unity" (tawhld,) "essence of separation"

(‘ayn-i tafriqa,) "the Mount Qaf of separation" (Qaf~i tafrld ,) S and it is related to Gnosis (ma c rifa.) The latter is the divine epiphany (tajalli,) which is defined as the "stage of ambiguity" (maqam-i iltibas,) "essence of unity" ('ayn~i jam*- ,/ and it is related to love (mahabba, ' i ishq.) kX In this stage, God manifests His Essence in His action and attributes, and shows Himself to the lover in the shape of the earthly beloved. The beloved is the mirror of the Godhead and is ultimately identified with God Himself.

-If you have read the gilded book (riame-i muzawwar,) you have understood in the lines of beauties of the creation the spelling of the symbol of "God created Adam in His shape." The beauties of the creation have the light of the [Divine] action. The complexion (rang) of Adam has the heritage of the beauty of the mine, and the intimacy of the lover has the heritage of the love of that Face. You read in "Adam" [of the above hadlth] "Adam" of the Qur'anic verse, "prostrate yourself [to Adam!]" [/.] The creature does not have these characteristics which man has, because man [lit. men] has the freshness (tarawat) of the meaning of "I breathed in him my Spirit" [?,] and "I created [Adam] with my two hands," [/.] The hidden beauties (mukhaddarat~i azal) appear in the face of man in search for the locus of [the Qur'anic verse] "We have honored the descendants of Adam," [/] at the time of the annihilation of the soul, because the mirror is the essence of union C'-ayn-i jam z .) Listen to the hadith, 'whoever saw me saw God,' because in this hadlth there is an indication of ambiguity (iltibas) and union (ittihad ,) l>

Thus, it is in the context of the epiphany of God in the shape of a

beauty and the ultimate identification between God and the beloved that this hadlth is quoted. However, in the ecstatic love of the mystics, the lover and the beloved are united, and it is the mystic lover who becomes the place of epiphany of God. In this context appears the motif of a mystic's acquirement of the Divine character alongside with the *imago Dei* hadlth.

To see the dress (*libas*) of the Divine Beauty on the character of Adam is the pure joy of love upon the form of the universe. Whoever attains the state (*hal*) of "acquire [the godly character!]" will sow the seed of the eternal love in the field of "God created Adam in His shape" . . . When one who is lost in eternal love saves his soul out of the veil of the created sea, he will see the beauty of God in the nowhere place which has no traces. He cannot endure the Sun of the Majesty. He is told as follows: Be the guest of the theophany (*tajalli*) of "Behold the mountain!" [/] in temporal things, so that I can show you this world in the dress of the form of Adam.

When the man was specified with these two relations [i.e., the form and the spirit,] he acquired the characteristics of God.

He [i.e., man] brightened up the world with His light. God said concerning man, "I formed you, and perfected your forms" [/] When He gave perfection to humanity. He praised Himself without a trace of temporality, and said, "Blessed be God, the best of creators" [/] It is this secret that the leader of spirits and bodies, the cream of the ocean of lights, the knight of the fields of secrets [i.e., Muhammad] alluded to in the language of ambiguity, when he said in the station of love out of the secret of the emotion of love in the blindness of the gnosis concerning the dressing of oneself in action, "God created Adam in His image."

As a conclusion, two characteristics of Ruzbihan's treatment of the *imago Dei* hadlth should be noted here. First, he does not distinguish

the image of God from man, i.e., Adam created in His image, as Philo and early Christian fathers did. Secondly, he uses very often the term "manifestation" (tajalll.) God manifests Himself in Adam through all the Names and Attributes. The universe itself is the manifestations of God through His actions and attributes. "You should see the hundred thousand manifestations in each atom and in each stone ." The concept of "manifestation" is later taken over by Ibn 'Arabi, and becomes the central doctrine of his ontology. However, in Ruzbihan Baqli, this term does not have any philosophical foundation. On the whole, his description is full of ambiguous metaphors and expressions, but lacks any philosophical and theological content. In this, he belongs to the same class of mystics as Hallaj.

Ghazzali

Before Ibn 'Arabi, Ghazzali was the most important thinker who tried to explain the *imago Dei* hadith using theological and philosophical concepts. Jabre and Altmann have already discussed Ghazzali's treatment of this hadith. The latter especially paid due attention to the connection between this hadith and the Delphic hadith, "Whoever knows himself knows his Lord," and compared Ghazzali and Ibn 'Arabi in this respect. Unfortunately, however, his analysis is marred by the inaccurate translation of the *Mishkat al-Anwar* by Gairdner, on which he relies heavily in his analysis .

Ghazzali discusses this hadith frequently. Here we examine his uses of the *imago Dei* motif in the *Ihya' c Ulum al-Dln*, the *Imla' fl Ishkalat a -Ihya'*, *al-Maqṣad al-Asnā' fl Sharh Ma'ani Asmā' Allāh al-Husnā* , the *Mishkat al-Anwar* , and *al-Madnun al-Saghīr*.

Ihya c Ulum al-Din

In the *Ihya*, the *imago Dei* hadith appears several times. The most important occasion is that where he enumerates five causes of love, all of which exist in the case of man's love of God. The fifth cause of love is correspondence (munasaba) and affinity (mushakala) between

the two, namely similis simili gaudet. And Ghazzali affirms that this fifth cause of love also exists between God and man, because there are hidden correspondences between them. Some of them can be disclosed, some of them not. To the former belongs the moral obligation of man to acquire godly character. Man is ordered by God to imitate the character of God (takhalluq bi-akhlaq Allah.) Here the correspondence between God and man lies in the commonness of attributes, such as "justice," "goodness" and "mercy." However, they are not treated in the theological context, but in the context of practical ethics. This moral obligation to imitate God as much as one can, appears already in Plato and is widely accepted in late antiquity.

As for the correspondences which are not allowed to be spoken out, Ghazzali hints that they have something to do with the following verse of the Qur'an. "People will ask you of the spirit; say, 'The spirit belongs to the affair (amr) of the Lord'" (./.) And he continues:

This verse indicates that it is a divine affair (amr rabbani) outside the limit of the intelligences- of the creature.

The following words of God are clearer: "when I formed and breathed into him my spirit" [/, ./.] Because of this, the angels prostrated themselves to him. To this allude the words of God, "I will make thee vicegerent on earth," [/] since if it were not through this correspondence, Adam would not have been worthy to be the vicegerent of God. And also to this alludes the hadith, "God created Adam in His image."

Those who are short of understanding thought wrongly that there is no form (sura) except for the outer form which can be perceived through the senses,, and they anthropomorphized (shabbahu) God, and thought that He has a body and an outer form. God be exalted from what the ignorant say about Him.

And also to this the words of God to Moses: "I feel ill, because you did not visit Me." Moses asked, "O God, how is it possible?" God said to him, "My slave so and so became sick,

and you did not visit him. If you had visited him, you would have found Me in his place." As for this correspondence, it does not appear except through devoting yourself assiduously to the supererogatory devotions (muwazaba c ala al-nawafil) after having carried out the religious duties well, just as God said, "The slave continues to approach Me though the supererogatory devotions so that I love him, and if I love him, I am his hearing through which he hears and his sight through which he sees, his tongue through which he speaks."

As for this subject, I must stop the pen here.

From the above hints concerning the unspeakable correspondence between man and God, the following points must be noted:

- . The imago Dei hadith indicates the higher, unspeakable correspondence between man and God.
- . The correspondence lies in the human spirit, which is breathed into man by God, and belongs to the divine domain.
- . The correspondence has something to do with the mystical union with God, as the two latter hadiths suggest.

Imla * fi Ishkalat al-Ihva

The Imla' is a short treatise which Ghazzali wrote to clarify some difficult points in the Ihya'. One of the problems discussed there is the meaning of the imago Dei hadith . s

After having refuted those interpretations in which the pronoun of "his image" is explained as referring to other than God, Ghazzali gives two interpretations to this hadith. In the first interpretation the pronoun is explained as the possessive genitive (idafa mulklya.)

He gives examples of the possessive genitive such as "his slave," "his house," and suggests that the relation between God and the image is just

like the relation between the owner of a slave and a slave. This interpretation is similar to that of Ibn Hazm. However, in Ghazzali, this interpretation leads to the assertion that "His image" means the Greater Universe in its entirety, because the universe is the possession of God par excellence. Thus the liadlth comes to mean that God created man as a miniature copy of the universe. Then he enumerates in detail the correspondences between man, the microcosm and the universe, the macrocosm .

In the second interpretation, the pronoun is taken as the genitive of particularization (idafa al-takhsls.) Since no example is given for this genitive, what Ghazzali means by this term is obscure. Whatever this "genitive of particularization" may mean, the hadith is interpreted as the indication of the commonness of names God and Adam share: God is Living, Powerful, Hearer, Seer, Knower, Wilier, Speaker, and Doer, and God created Adam as living, powerful, etc . In this interpretation, "His image" seems to be identified with His Names, although Ghazzali does not state so explicitly. Rather, he emphasizes that this commonness of names only means that they are pronounced in the same way, nothing more.

Adam had a [real] shape which was sensible, formed, created, determined in actuality. God is attached to the form only in utterance (bl-'-lafz,) because these divine Names such as "Living," "Powerful" etc. did not unite (tajtami) in the attributes of Adam except in names which are only external utterances ibarat talaffuz.) Do not think from this the denial of [divine] Attributes. This is not our intention.

Our intention is only to differentiate as far as possible between the two forms [i.e., the form of God and the form of man,] so that they [the attributes of Adam] may not unite in the Attributes of God except in utterance of names .

The above statement can be understood through the knowledge of the doctrine of the Names and Attributes of God in the Ashcarites. God is

"living" through life [attribute,] but the Mu'tazilites denied the existence of the Attributes as being distinct from the Essence. Being an Asharite, Ghazzali does not deny the existence of Attributes, which are neither separate from nor identical with the Essence. However, "Life" (as an attribute of God) is not life in our sense of the word, which we understand and apply to creatures. They are common only in utterance.

This second explanation of Ghazzali is quite insufficient as an interpretation of the *imago Dei* hadith. If the names of Adam and God are entirely different in meaning, like homonyms, where is the correspondence between them? Although an answer is not found in the *Imla'*, a more detailed discussion on the commonness of the names can be found in his other book, *al-Maqṣad al-Asrīya* ft *Sharh Ma'anī Asmā' Allāh al-Husna*.

Maqsad al-Asna ft Sharh Ma'ani Asma Allah al-Husna

The Maqsad is a commentary on the meanings of the ninety-nine names of God. In his introduction to this book, Ghazzali discusses the theological problem of the relation between "name" (ism,) "the named" (musamma) and "naming" (tasmiya,) S The problem of the commonness of names between God and man is extensively treated in the last section of this introduction, entitled "On Showing that Perfection and Happiness of Man Is in the Imitation of God's Character and the Adornment with the Meanings of His Attributes and Names insofar as This Is Conceivable of Man." The argument here is quite incoherent and it is difficult to follow his logic faithfully; in Jabre's words, "on est frappe de prime abord par le caractere etrange du developpement. ,

First, he distinguishes two classes of people according to their understanding of the meanings of Divine Names: the unfortunate and the fortunate. The former is further divided into three sub-classes. The first comprises those who only hear the pronunciation of the Names;

their understanding is like that of animals and foreigners. The second comprises those who understand their meanings in detailed explanation (tafsir) and their conventional rules. This is the understanding of linguists or rather that of normal people who understand Arabic. The third class is of those who believe with their heart that these meanings belong to God. This level of understanding is comparable to that of young men, actually, however, it is the understanding of most of the learned scholars ('ulama') S

As for the fortunate people who are called the muqarrabitn (the people who approach God as much as possible,) they are also further divided into three sub-classes. The first is of those who understand the meaning of the Divine Names in a Sufic way, that is, through "unveiling" (mukashafa) and "immediate perception" (mushahada.) The second class is of those who admire the greatness of these Names thus known and desire to possess them as much as they possibly can and approach God through these Names. In order to do this, one must get rid of other desires from the heart, otherwise the seed of this desire which is planted in the heart will not grow successfully. The third category is of those who actually try to acquire (iktisab) these Attributes of God as far as their power can reach, and imitate God's Attributes and adorn themselves with them. Through this, man will become lord-like (rabbani) and similar in rank to the angels. u

Then Ghazzali clarifies the concept of "nearness" (qurb), which corresponds to the degree of perfection (kamal.) The more perfect one becomes, the nearer one approaches to the Absolute Perfection, which is God. He makes the hierarchy of existents according to their degree of perfection. Existents are divided into two classes: the living and the dead. The former class is more perfect than the latter. Next, the living are divided into three ranks (darajat): angel, man and animal.

Man occupies the middle rank between angels and animals. This intermediary position is due to man's sharing the characteristics of both angels and animals. The angels are higher in rank because their perception is not affected by nearness or distance of the objects, and their actions are not motivated by desire or anger. Man is the middle being

because he has a body and is dominated by outer senses and desire and anger. However, if there appears in him the desire for perfection, he can overcome other desires, and take on the resemblance of the angels.

Characteristics of life are perception and action, which are liable to deficiency, mediocrity, and perfection. ' The more you imitate angels in these characteristics, the further away you are from the animal qualities and nearer to the angels.

The angels are near to God. Therefore, one who is near to the angels is near to God.

So far the discussion is on the theme of the moral obligation to acquire godly character, which, as we have seen in the *Ihya'*, is the non-secret, esoteric correspondence between man and God. However, at this point comes the abrupt change of subject. The above argument indicates that, if one acquires the godly character, he becomes similar to God. But as is said in the Qur'an, there is nothing similar to God. Ghazzali's answer to this criticism is the strong affirmation of the absolute transcendence of God. If two things share the same description, this does not necessarily indicate their closeness. Rather, entirely opposite things can share the same names. For instance,

"black" and "white" share the common descriptions of "color," "accident," and "perceptible to the eye." Although man and horse can share the common attribute of "smartness" (kiyasa,) the horse does not have any likeness (mithl) of man, because "smartness" is the accident which is outside the quidity (mahlya,) which consists of the essence of man. The Essence of God, which is the necessary existence, cannot be known by man nor shared by him. These Divine Attributes, which are shared by man do not pertain to His Essence, therefore there is no resemblance (mumathala) between God and man. In this sense, no one can know God's essential nature except God Himself, and Ghazzali quotes the saying of Junayd, "No one knows God except God."* ,

So far, the argument has shifted from the ethical exhortation of *imitatio Dei* to the theological affirmation of the unknowability of the

Divine Essence. With this change, the Attributes under discussion also change from moral qualities to theological Attributes devoid of moral qualities, such as "life," "sight," etc. And Ghazzali here seems to accept the possibility of man's knowledge of non-essential Attributes of God. Thus, alongside the saying of Junayd, he also agrees to the saying, "I don't know anything except God," at a different level. His example is as follows:

If you show someone a piece of writing, and ask whether he knows the writer, and he says "no," the answer is correct.

And if he says, "yes, the writer is a living' man, capable, hearing, seeing, and sound of hand, knowing the art of writing, and I know all these things about him, so how do I not know him?" This answer is also correct in another way.

In the above quotation, the piece of writing is compared to creation, i.e., the universe. From creation, we can infer that God has such and such qualities. But it does not mean that he really knows God as to who He is, just like the person in the above example does not really know the writer as to who he is. In this way, Ghazzall again emphasizes that the Names of God are derived from Attributes, which do not really describe His Essence. It is as if someone asks what this is, pointing to some animal, and gets the answer that it is tall, or it is white. Thus, Names such as "Powerful," "Knower" only indicate that something unknown and uncanny has the qualities of knowledge and power. In short, this position is taken by Ghazzall to safeguard the transcendence of God by radically distinguishing His Essence from the Attributes. Only latter can be known by us through creation.

Then it is asked of Ghazzall what is the way (sabll) to the knowledge of God. The question seems redundant, because the answer is already given in the above discussion. However, the answer given by him is considerably different. Here Ghazzall denies even the possibility of knowing the Attributes, because the meanings of the Divine Attributes and the meanings of these attributes which we understand in reference to ourselves are fundamentally different.

First, Ghazzall distinguishes two types of knowledge: knowledge gained through direct experience and knowledge gained by inference. The example he gives is of the knowledge of sexual pleasure. Sexual pleasure can be known either by experience or by inference, for instance, by comparing it to the pleasure experienced when one eats sugar. Of course, only the first type of knowledge is real knowledge. However, this type of knowledge is closed for man with regard to the knowledge of God. The second type of knowledge leads to illusion (tawahhum, Iham,) because one compares something to some other thing which it does not in reality resemble at all. For instance, the sexual union has no similarity at all with sugar, although both can be described as pleasure (lidhr dha.) They are only sharing the same name (musharaka fl '-ism,) but in reality there is no correspondence (munasaba) between the two. Then he applies this theory to the Attributes of God. The Life of God and our.lives are only common in pronunciation, they are in reality as different as sexual union and .sugar. To know the Life of God through our lives is as illusory as knowing sexual pleasure through the pleasure of eating sugar.

His agnosticism is then extended to everything of which we cannot have direct experience, from the knowledge of prophethood, Heaven, and Hell to that of sorcery. Not only can we not know God except by inferring from the names and attributes within us, but also we cannot know Heaven and Hell except by inferring from the names and attributes within us. "Sorcery can only be known by a sorcerer himself." Therefore the ultimate goal of the knowledge of God is to know its impossibility. And he quotes the famous saying attributed to Abu Bakr, "the impossibility of achieving knowledge is the only knowledge."

Then the further question is asked of him why, in spite of the fact that the knowledge of God is utterly impossible for the creature, there are still differences in the degree of knowledge between angels, prophets, saints, and ordinary men. In answering the question, Ghazzall again shifts from total agnosticism to the possibility of the knowledge of attributes through creation. The more deeply one understands His

works in the universe, the more advanced one becomes in his knowledge of God. As an example, he compares the door-keeper's knowledge of Shafi c I with that of his disciple. The door-keeper knows that Shafi c i is a knower of the sharl c a, he writes many books, and he is the guide to the creature to God, but his drsciple who reads his books and understands them knows Shafi c I in real sense.

The above example contradicts his previous example of sex and sugar, because the disciple's knowledge of his master is real knowledge, while the knowledge of sexual pleasure through comparison is an illusory and imperfect knowledge. To know God through His works and to know Him through inference from our attributes are two different things, but Ghazzall places them alongside each other.

Thus the gist concerning the Power of God for us is that it is an Attribute (wasf,) and its fruit and traces are the existence of things. The name "power" is pronounced for this, because it corresponds to our power, just as the pleasure of sex corresponds to the pleasure of sugar. Our power is entirely different from the reality of the divine Power. Yes, the more a slave increases the understanding of the details of the objects of His creative Power and the wonders of His work in the Divine domain of the Heavens (malakut al-samawat,) the more abounding his lot becomes concerning the knowledge of the Attribute of Power, because the fruit indicates the One who bears the fruit (muthmir.) In the same manner, the more a disciple increases in cognizance of the details of the knowledge of his master and his writings, the more perfect his knowledge of his master becomes and the more perfect his admiration for him becomes.

The knowledge of His works, i.e., the universe, certainly does not lead to the knowledge of His Essence, but only of His Attributes. This seems to imply that His Attributes are agents of the creation of the universe, and the universe is their effect. A disciple's knowledge of the master through his work appears to be another example of man's knowledge of the Creator through the knowledge of His works. But this

example is still different from the example of one's knowledge of the writer through inference from a mere piece of writing. It is possible for a disciple to advance his knowledge and become equal with his master. If a disciple attains such a degree, the master and the disciple share the same knowledge and the same object of knowledge. And this is the real commonness between man and God, which we have seen in Origen treated in the previous section.

However, Ghazzali takes a different line when he explains the cause-effect relationship between God and the universe. His example is the Neo-Platonic metaphor of the sun and light. As the sun emanates light, which makes colors and shapes appear to the eyes, God's light existentiates all the objects of the universe; whatever we see is the light of the sun; light is from the sun, and also not different from it. Therefore, we can say that we do not see anything except the sun. It is in this meaning that the above quoted saying, "I know nothing but God," should be interpreted, because "God is the spring of existence, which emanates upon every existent; there is nothing in existence except God." This existential monism is not an isolated case in Ghazzali.

A similar thought is also found in the Mishkat al-Anwar. aA

It is not our aim here to explain his contradictions and systematize his thought. Rather, we summarize the main points of his thought in the following manner:

- . The Essence of God is unknowable to man.
- . The commonness of names and attributes between God and man is not real. Knowledge of God through names and attributes which we understand in reference to ourselves is inadequate and, indeed, illusory.
- . Knowledge of God through His works is possible. The existence of the universe comes from God, and, in a way, it is His existence. Therefore, knowledge of the universe leads to knowledge of God.

Mishkat al~Anwar

The Mishkat al~Anwar is considered as one of the esoteric books of Ghazzali. The treatise is divided in two parts: the first part deals with the esoteric interpretation of the Light verse (/) while the second part deals with the interpretation of the hadlth of the seven hundred veils.

In this treatise, the imago Dei hadlth appears three times. The first discussion on this hadlth appears in the first chapter. First Ghazzali asserts that besides the physical eye, man has an inner eye, which is more worthy of and fitting to the name "eye." This is the intellect. He then explicitly states that the terms "spirit" (ruh) and "soul" (nafs) both refer to this intellect. The physical eye cannot see objects which are too near or too far away, but the distance does not hinder the intellect from perceiving objects, because it transcends space.

It [the intellect] is the copy (unmudhaj) of the Light of God, and the copy cannot be devoid of similarity (muhakat) even if it does not rise to the summit of equality (musa-wat,) and this may move you to understand the secret of Muhammad's saying, "God created Adam in his image."

Although Ghazzall hesitates to give further explanations, we can at least know the following points from the above passage. First, the imago Dei hadith refers to the human intellect. Secondly, the hadith expresses the model-copy relationship. The copy is the intellect within us, and the model is the divine Light. This relationship implies similarity, but not equality.

The second place in which the imago Dei hadith is quoted is the most difficult passage to interpret, and called by Altmann the "acme of al-Ghazzall's mystical interpretation on self-knowledge. , Here Ghazzali discusses the Sufis' experience of the-perfect union with God, that is, fana' , or more properly, fana' al-fana' , because in this stage one does not have even the consciousness of fana' . Although

some call this stage ittihad (union,) he prefers to call it tawhid (unity, unification.) There is no higher stage to ascend to for the mystic who has achieved this stage. The only possibility left for him is to descend to the lowest heaven (nuzul ila sama' al-dunya.) Then he quotes the following words of the sages affirmatively, "the descent to the lowest heaven is the descent of an angel (nuzul malak,)" while he disapproves the words of some sages, "it is the descent of God, namely God descends to use the mystic's senses and move his members." For Ghazzall, the latter view is an illusion (tawahhum) of those who are immersed in the Divine Singularity (fardanlya.) However, those who claim the descent of God refer to the hadlth of nawafil, "I become his hearing through which he hears, his sight through which he sees, and his tongue through which he speaks," and God's words to Moses, "I became sick, but you did not visit me." The opinion which Ghazzall refutes here is the incarnation (hulul) theory of Hallaj.

Motions of this perfect realizer of unification (muwahhid) derive from the lower heaven, and his senses (ihsasat,) such as hearing and seeing, from the heaven above it, and his intellect from the still higher heaven, and he rises from the heaven of the intellect to the extreme ascent of creatures (muntatia mi'raj al-khala'iq.) The Kingdom of Singularity (mamlakat al-fardanlya) is the end of seven levels (sab' tabaqat.) After this He sits on the Throne of the Absolute Unity (wahdanlya,) and from there He manages the affair for the seven levels of His heaven. Maybe one sees such a mystic and applies to him the saying, "God created Adam in the image of the Merciful One." However, if one contemplates it attentively, one knows that this saying has an interpretation (ta'wil) just like the saying, "I am God," or "Glory to me," and also like God's words to Moses, "I became sick and you did not visit me," and "I become his hearing, his sight, and his tongue." But now I must stop the explanation here.

Thus the imago Dei hadlth expresses, though erroneously, the incarnation of God in the body of a mystic. For Ghazzall, this is an illusion of mystics, and the imago Dei hadlth requires an interpretation,

like the shathiyat of mystics. Although the correct interpretation is not given by him, the words of the sages, "the descent of an angel," which Ghazzali approves of, seems to suggest the interpretation. In the above quoted passage, he discusses the condition of the perfect mystic in relation to his motions, senses, and the intellect. It is his intellect which rises to the highest heaven of the Kingdom of Singularity. It is possible that in this heaven he becomes identical with the angel. We have seen that in the Maqsad, man is placed between the angel and the animal. The more perfect one becomes, the nearer he approaches the rank of the angel. Then the one who achieves the highest ascent of creatures becomes identical with the angel. Altmann suggests that the mystic unites not with God, but with the supernal intellect. Since the supernal intellects are identical with angels according to the Muslim philosophers, it is possible that Ghazzali also considered the angel as the supernal intellect. As we have seen in the Maqsad, the characteristics of the angel are those of the intellect.

The third and last part in which the *imago Dei* hadith is used is especially important, because here this hadith is combined with the Delphic hadith, "Whoever knows himself . . ." In this part, Ghazzali explains the correspondence (*munasaba*) and homology (*muwazana*) between

the higher world, which is also called the "spiritual world" and the "intelligible world," and the visible universe. The key to the correspondence is symbolism (*tamthil*) ; the visible universe is the symbol (*mithal*) of the Higher World. After having explained what the sun, the moon, the planets, the mountain and valleys of the visible world symbolize in the higher world, he continues as follows:

There is in it [i.e., the presence of Lordship, *hadra al-rububiyah*] something with which detailed sciences are engraved in the [spiritual] substances (*jawahir*) susceptible of them, and its symbol (*mithal*) is the Pen. If there is among these receiving substances some [substance] which precedes others, in reception, and from it [these sciences] are transmitted to others, its symbol is the Well-Preserved Tablet, and Spread Parchment. If above the engraver of the sciences [i.e., the

Pen] there is something which governs [the Pen,] its symbol is the Hand. And if this Presence, which comprises the Hand, the Tablet, the Pen, the Book, has the arranged order (tartib manzum,) its symbol is the Image sura [i.e., the higher universe can, symbolically be said to possess the image.] If a similar kind of order is found in the human image (sura inslyah,) then it [the human image] is in the image of the Merciful One. There is a difference between the saying "in the image of God," and "in the image of the Merciful One," because it is the Divine Mercy (rahma ilahiyah) which formed the Divine Presence (al-hadra al-ilahiyah) with this image. Then God bestowed a favor upon Adam and gave him a summary image (sura mukhtasara) which comprises (jami'a) all the species of what exists in the universe, so that it is as if he were everything in the universe, or he were a copy (nuskha) of the summary universe. And the image of Adam — I mean this image — is written with the writing of God . . . Were it not for this divine Mercy, man would not be able to know his Lord, because none can know his Lord except the one who knows himself. Since this was due to the effects (athar) of Mercy, he was in the image of the Merciful One, not in the image of God. The presence of Divinity (hadrat al-ilahiyah) is different from the Presence of the Kingship (hadrat al-mulk) and also from that the Lordship . . . If it were not for this reason, it would be necessary to say "in His image;" however, the correct text which appears in the Sahih of Bukhari is "in the image of the Merciful One ."

Ghazzali's train of thought in the above passage is not easy to follow. In the first part, he deals with the correspondences between the higher world, which is here called "the Presence of Lordship," and the lower world, i.e., the visible universe. However, the topic suddenly changes to the correspondence between the higher world and man. Both have an analogous order, that is, both possess a common image. Therefore, man can be said to be created in the image of the higher world,

that is, he is modeled according to the order of the higher world. However, in the second part, the correspondence between man and the universe is detailed; man is a miniature copy of the universe and comprises everything which exists in the universe. Ghazzall is not clear as to whether the universe in this context means the higher world or the lower world, i.e., the visible universe. However, this question is not important, because there is a close correspondence between the two worlds; the one is the symbol of the other. Thus, the higher world, the visible universe, and man coincide, because their images are analogous. And thanks to this correspondence man's knowledge leads to the knowledge of his Lord. It must be noted that this knowledge does not mean the knowledge of God, i.e., His essence. Ghazzall in the above quotation emphasizes the differences between "the image of God (Allah)" and "the image of the Merciful (Rahman.)" The Divine Names should be differentiated in reference to man and the visible universe. "The Merciful," "the King," and "the Lord" give different effects to man and the universe.

The Higher World is the presences (hadarat) of many different Names of God. Thus man, who knows himself, knows the Presence of Lordship, that is, he knows His Name, "the Lord," but not His Name, Allah. The fact that man has the analogous order to that of the universe is the effect of His Name, "the Merciful," thus man is created in the image of the Merciful.

a-Madnun al-Saehir

Al-Madnim al-Saghrlr is another of Ghazzall's esoteric treatises. However, its authorship has sometimes been disputed. The treatise consists of questions and answers concerning the creation of Adam.

The treatise begins with the explanations of the meanings of "forming" (taswiya) and "inbreathing" (nafkh) in the Qur'anic verse, "when I formed him and breathed into him my Spirit" (/, /.) Next, he discusses the nature of the human spirit . The spirit is a substance (jawhar.)

His proof is as follows. It knows itself, and its Creator, and perceives the intelligibles (ma c qulat.) Thus, it has various kinds of

knowledge (culm,) which are accidents (a*-rad.) An accident can only subsist in a substance, not in another accident. Therefore, the spirit is a substance. However, the spirit is not body, and thus does not occupy space (ghayr mutahayyiz.) It is neither inside nor outside of the body, neither connected with nor separate from the body, because these are characteristics of those things which occupy space .

Then, Ghazzali points out that the above characteristics of the spirit are also those of the Attributes of God. Some vulgar people like the schools of Karramiya and Hanbaliya could not think of existence outside the body, and claimed that God has a body . Some like the Ash'arites and the Mu'tazilites affirmed the above mentioned transcendental characteristics only in reference to the Attributes of God. And they regarded those who attribute these characteristics to the human spirits as infidels, saying that those who say such things are claiming godhead for themselves. Their false accusation comes from their opinion that if two things which occupy the same place share the same characteristics, they cannot be distinguished, therefore they are identical. Ghazzali refutes this opinion, saying that there are three ways to distinguish two things which share the same characteristics, namely through space, time, and definition (hadd) and essence (haqlqa .) Of course, the distinction between God and the human spirit can be made through definition and essence. The characteristics which God and the spirit share, such as "non-spatialness" (al-bar'a can al-makan wa al-jiha) are not the essential characteristics of God, which only God possesses. The essential characteristic of God is that He is sustainer of all things (qayyum,) subsisting by His Essence (qa'im bi-dhatihi.)

All other existents exist through Him. They are non-existent in reference to their essences. They borrow existence from God. In this respect, the human spirit shares the characteristics of the creature. Ghazzali denies the pre-existence of the human spirit. Like other creatures, it is created by God.

However, the Qur'anic verse, "I breathed into him my spirit (min ruh),)" indicates the special relation (nisba) between God and the human spirit, through which it is distinguished from other creatures.

Ghazzali explains this special relation in the following way, using the metaphor of the emanation of light from the sun.

It [the Qur'anic verse] is like the words of the sun: If the sun could speak, it would say, "I poured forth (afadtu) upon earth my light (min nurl)" . . . The light which the earth receives is of the same kind as the light of the sun in a certain respect, although it is extremely weak in relation to the light of the sun. You already know that the spirit is transcendent of direction and space, capable of knowing all things. These are the correspondences (mudahat) and affinity (munasaba) [between God and the spirit.]

Then Ghazzali is asked about the meaning of the *imago Dei* hadlth.

He first states that the *sura* (image, form) is a homonym (ism mushtarak,) and can be used both of sensible things in the literal sense and of abstract things in the sense of "order" (tartib,) "structure" (tarkib,) "proportionateness" (tanasub,) like the "sura of the question" and the "sura of the event." Of course, in the hadlth the *sura* is used in the latter sense.

The hadlth refers to the correspondence (mudahat) between man and God. This correspondence stems from essence (dhat,) attributes (sifat,) and actions (af-al.) As for the essence, the essence of the spirit (ruh) is as follows: it subsists in itself * it is neither accident nor body, nor spatial substance (jawhar mutahayyiz); it does not occupy space, nor has direction; it is not connected with the body nor the world, nor is it separate from them; it is not inside of the universe or the body, nor outside of them. The same descriptions also apply to the Essence of God.

As for the attributes, the explanation is the same as the second interpretation of the *imago Dei* hadlth in the *Imla'*: God created man as living, knowing, powerful, willing, hearing, seeing, and speaking.

All these also apply to God. However, unlike the Imla', the commonness of names is here not restricted to pronunciation.

As for the actions, the explanation is most lengthy. Man's action has the same order (tartlb) as God's. Just as man's action is carried out through long chains of intermediaries (e.g., the will in the heart -> brain-> nerves-> sinews-> hands-> pen,) so God's action is not carried out except through long chains of intermediaries, that is, angels and planets. Here the macrocosm-microcosm motif comes into the foreground. Man's control over his body (microcosm) resembles the Creator's control over the universe (macrocosm.) And the enumerates the points of correspondence between the macrocosm and the microcosm in detail.

Next, Ghazzall is asked about the meaning of the Delphic hadlth, "whoever knows himself . . . , He first affirms the Empedoclean principle of "likes are known by likes:" things are known through the corresponding copies (al-amthila al-munasiba.) Were it not for this correspondence (mudahat,) man could not advance from his self-knowledge to the knowledge of the Creator. In the same way, if there were no correspondence between the universe and man, man's knowledge of the universe would be impossible.

If God had not united in man the copy (mithal) of the entire universe, so that he is like the summary copy (nuskha mukJrtasara.) of the universe,. and like the lord (rabb) who exercises dominion over his universe [i.e., the body,] man would not know the universe, nor Dominion (tasarruf,) nor Lordship (rubublya,) nor intellect ('aql,) nor Power, nor Knowledge, nor the rest of the Divine Attributes. However, the soul (nafs) became the ladder (mirqat) to the knowledge of its Creator, thanks to correspondence and parallelism (muwazana .)

It should be noted that here Ghazzall interprets the term nafs in the Delphic hadlth as the soul. As we have seen in the Mishkat , the

intellect, the spirit, and the soul are identical. Because of the correspondence between God and the soul, the one who knows his soul, knows

God. This correspondence is that of actions in- the previous discussion. Because the soul acts like the lord over its body, it is, in a way, a god in microcosm. Thus, it has the Divine Attributes in itself, and by knowing itself, it can know the Attributes of God, the Lord of the macrocosm. Lastly, in the above quotation, it is said that man's self-knowledge also leads to his knowledge of the universe, but here the knowledge of the universe is not well related to the knowledge of God, because the relation between God and the universe is not discussed at all.

Ibn 'Arabi

Ibn 'Arabi's anthropology is often labeled as the theory of the Perfect Man. It is true that Ibn 'Arabi is the first thinker to use the phrase "the Perfect Man" in a technical sense. However, although the term entered into the common vocabulary among the later followers of Ibn 'Arabi, and was made famous especially by Jil's *al-Insan al-Kamil fl Ma'rifat al-Makhir wa al-Ma'il*, Ibn 'Arabi himself used the term rather infrequently in his works. For instance, it is used only once in the three important treatises on metaphysics edited by H. S. Nyberg. The term does not appear at all in the *Shajarat al-Kawn*, although S. H. Nasr thinks that this treatise is specially concerned with the idea of the Perfect Man. In his most mature and influential work, the *Fusus al-Hikam*, the term is used only seven times. In this section we examine Ibn 'Arabi's philosophy of man, conceptualized by "the Perfect Man," and symbolized by Adam created in the image of God.

The Perfect Man As Adam

In four cases out of the entire seven occurrences of the phrase "the Perfect Man" in the *Fusus al-Hikam*, the phrase is used in the description of Adam. Indeed, three instances of this phrase occur in the chapter on Adam. Thus, the concept of the Perfect Man is closely

related to his speculation on Adam, who is created in God's image as His vicegerent on earth. The following is the clearest description of the Perfect Man.

Iblis was [just] a part of the universe, and this synthesis (jam : lyā) [which Adam possessed] did not occur in him.

Because of the [synthesis], Adam was the vicegerent. If he were not manifest in the image of Him who appointed him the vicegerent in the universe, he would not be the vicegerent.

And if there were not in him everything required by his subjects, over whom he is appointed the vicegerent — because of their dependency on him, it is necessary that he provide them with everything they need — he would not be the vicegerent over them. Therefore the vicegerency is fitting only for the Perfect Man. He [God] composed his outer image (sura zahira) from the realities (haqa'iq) of the universe and its forms, and He composed his inner image (sura batina) in His own image .

In the above quotation, Adam is characterized as "synthesis." The concept of "synthesis" (jam'lyā) is one of the most important key words of Ibn 'Arabi's anthropology. At the beginning of the chapter on Adam, it is said that God wanted to see His Essence (cayn) in a synthetical being (kawn jami C J which encompasses (yahsur) all His affair (amr,) and He created Adam . But of what is man the synthesis? As is apparent from the above quotation, he is the synthesis of the image of God and the image of the universe. In the passage which precedes the above quotation, Ibn 'Arabi writes, commenting on the Qur'anic verse, "What prevents you from prostrating yourself to one whom I have created with my two hands?" (/):

What prevents him [i.e., Satan] [from prostrating himself to Adam] is nothing else but [Adam's] very synthesis (jam c) of the two images, that is, the image of the universe and the image of God.

The outer form of Adam clearly signifies the physical body of man, and the inner form his spiritual faculty. Further, Ibn 'ArabI remarkably interprets the nawafil hadlth, "I [God] become his hearing through which he hears, his sight through which he sees," in this context.

Therefore He said in the hadlth, "I become his hearing and his sight." He did not say, "I become his eye and his ear," because He distinguished the two forms, [i.e., the eye and the ear belong to the physical world.]

Also in the last part of the chapter on Adam, Ibn 'ArabI concludes his discussion as follows:

You knew the wisdom of the formation (nash'a) of Adam, I mean his outer image; also you knew the formation of the spirit (ruh) of Adam, I mean his inner image . . . and his saying,

"fear your lord," [means]: make what is outer in you (mia . zahara minkum) a protection (wiqaya) for your lord, and make what is inner in you (mia bat ana minkum,) that is your lord, a protection for you.

We have already seen in the first part of this paper that in the Judeo-Christian tradition the theory of the double nature of man was widespread. In that tradition, the inner, godly nature of man refers to the spirit, or the soul, while the outer, worldly nature refers to the body. Now, it is the former which is created in the image of God. Therefore the above thought of Ibn 'ArabI belongs to this tradition.

Also in his other works, he frequently refers to this subject. In the Insha' al-Dawa'ir he writes:

Man consists of two copies (nuskhatan,) that is, the outer copy and the inner copy. The outer copy corresponds to the universe . . . and the inner copy corresponds to the Divine Presence .

Sometimes the vicegerency is assigned especially to the spirit. For instance, in al-Futiihat al-Makklya, after having explained the individual soul (al-nufiis al-juz'lya) as the spirit breathed in by God (al~riih al-manfukh,) Ibn 'Arabi writes:

God assigned them [i.e., the individual souls] to govern (tad~blr) the body, and appointed them as the vicegerent over it, making it clear to them that they are vicegerents in it .

The vicegerency of the spirit over the kingdom of the body and its government of it is the main subject of al~Tadbirat al-Ilahlya fi Islah al-Mamlaka al~lnsanlya.

However, the synthesis (jam*-lya,) or the totality (majmu c) which God confers upon Adam, and thanks to which he is the vicegerent, is also interpreted by Ibn 'Arabi in more metaphysical and theological terms. Thus Adam represents the synthesis of all the realities (haqa'lq) of the universe and all the Names of God, the former being his outer image, the latter his inner image. In the above first quotation of the description of the Perfect Man, it is said that, if there were not in him everything required by his subjects, he would not be the vicegerent.

What is required by his subjects is the realities of all the existents in the universe. The following description of the Perfect Man in the Fusiis al-Eikam explains this aspect of the synthesis more clearly.

He [God] created in this noble compendium (mukhtasar,) which is the Perfect Man, all the Divine Names and the realities of those which exist outside him in the greater universe which is separate (munfasil) from him. And He made him the spirit (r&ti) of the universe.

The concepts of "realities" and "the Divine Names" are taken by Ibn 'Arabi from Islamic theology, and his use of these terms closely bound to his metaphysics. Therefore, in order to understand the concept of "synthesis"

more deeply, it is necessary to investigate the ontological and epistemological functions of the realities of the universe and the Divine Names

in his metaphysics. In the following two sections, these two concepts are examined respectively, and the implications of each concept in relation to his interpretation of the *imago Dei* hadith are discussed in detail.

The Theory of Knowledge

The concept of "realities" is often used synonymously with the concept of "meanings, concepts" (*ma'-ani*) by Ibn 'Arabi, and firmly related to his epistemology.

Ibn 'Arabi defines knowledge as follows:

Now we first say that knowledge means a reality (*haqlqa*) in the mind (*nafs*), i.e., a reality which relates itself both to a non-existent and to an existent, in accordance with its reality on the basis of which it exists [in the case of an existent,] or would exist [in the case of a non-existent,] were it to come into existence. This reality is then knowledge.

The above definition of knowledge, although somewhat obscure, is extremely important to understand his epistemology. The definition is obscure, because the term "reality" is used twice in the definition: first is a reality in the mind as knowledge; second is a reality on the basis of which a thing exists. "Realities" are often qualified by Ibn 'Arabi with the adjectives "universal" (*kulllya*) and "intelligible in the mind" (*ma'qula fi al-dhihn*.) And he gives the following examples of "realities ."

Know that timber in its turn is but a special form of woodness ('udiya) do not conceive woodness except as intelligible and comprehensible reality (*al-haqiqa al-wa'quliya al-jarnica*.) It is found in every chair and ink-pot in its

entirety without any diminution or excess. Although there may be several realities in it, such as woodness (al-haqqa al-t-udlyya,) oblongness (istitaliya,) squareness (tar-bl'ya,) quantity (kammlya,) and so on, every one of them is found in its entirety.

Thus woodness, oblongness, squareness, and quantity are all called realities. In the Fusius al-Hikam, he also explains the universals (al-umur al-kullya) in terms of the "realities."

The prediction (hukm) of concrete objects is reducible to the universals in accordance with what the realities of these concrete existents demand, like the relation of knowledge to the knower and life to living. Life is an intelligible reality (haqlqa ma'qula,) and knowledge is also an intelligible reality which is different from life.

Thus, such abstract concepts as knowledge and life are called intelligible realities. In al-Futuhat al-Makkiya as well, he calls humanity (insanlyya) a reality.

Although Zayd is not identical with c Amr with respect to their shapes, he is identical with c Amr with respect to humanity (insanlyya.) He is not other than c Amr. If he is not other than c Amr with respect to humanity, then he is not his likeness, but they are identical. The reality of humanity is not divisible, rather it is in every man in its entirety, not in part. There is no likeness of humanity. The same applies to all other realities, £

From these examples of the use of "reality," we can conclude that realities are universals, that is, abstract concepts, synonymous with "meaning" (ma c na.)

Now it is clear why the term "reality" is used twice in the definition of knowledge quoted above. First it is the universal which exists in particular existents; secondly it is the universal in man's mind as

knowledge of a thing. For instance, in the case of man's knowledge of a dog, the modus operandi is as follows: there is a reality of the dog, i.e., "dogness" in every particular dog which exists in concreto. When man perceives a particular dog, the reality of the dog is registered in the mind, and this reality is his knowledge of the dog.

So far we have clarified his concept of "reality" and his theory of man's perceptive knowledge. Now we can go into one of the most characteristic points of his epistemology, that is, parallelism between man's knowledge and God's knowledge, and then his theory of non-perceptive knowledge, in which this parallelism is most clear. The most succinct and lucid exposition of his epistemology can be found in the small' treatise, *Insha' al-Dawa'ir* , which was later largely incorporated in the *Fututia t al-Makklya* .

In this treatise he uses consistent parallelism between man's knowledge and God's knowledge in the presentation of his theory of knowledge, and he calls this parallelism the correspondence (mudahat.) However, there is a fundamental difference between the two. God's knowledge is the perception (idrak) of the differentiated (mufassal) in the undifferentiated (mujmal ,) while man, on the other hand, can know the undifferentiated only through the differentiated, namely through temporal objects which occur in the phenomenal universe. In other words,

God's knowledge works deductively from the universal to particulars, while man's knowledge works inductively from particulars to the universal. In the case of God, Ibn 'Arabi thinks, like Islamic philosophers, that His knowledge is not in need of the sense-perception of particular existents in concreto. He does not perceive creatures which exist in the universe. His knowledge is universal, and He can differentiate this universal knowledge whenever He wants, and in this way He can reach the knowledge of particulars, which consist of a certain combination of universal .

This undifferentiated, most universal knowledge is called by Ibn 'Arabi "the reality of realities" (haqiqat al-haqa'iq,) or summmum

genus (jins al~ajnas.) The reality of realities is the knowledge of God; however, it is also man's knowledge, only he reaches this knowledge through the knowledge of particulars. Although the modus operandi is different, ultimately the knowledge of God and the knowledge of man are the same. And according to Ibn 'Arabi, herein lies the secret of the correspondence between God and man. This point will become clearer in his theory of self-knowledge.

We have already seen how man acquires the knowledge of existents in concreto through sense-perception. However, according to Ibn 'Arabi, man can also know a certain type of non-existents, namely the non-existents whose existence is logically possible, such as "griffin" or "phoenix.

If man's knowledge always follows sense-perception, and depends upon it, how can such a knowledge be possible? He solves this question by introducing the concept of mithl . He writes.

Knowledge relates itself to the non-existent by relating itself to the existing mithl of the non-existent.

The mithl primarily means the copy, i.e., the mental image created in the mind after the perception of the concrete object. Therefore, it can be considered an existent in knowledge, although not in concreto. Ibn 'Arabi further explains in more detail the modus operandi of man's knowledge of non-existents in concreto through mithl.

One of the conditions of knowledge's relation to the object of knowledge is that one single individual of that genus be existent [in concreto,] or parts of it be present scattered in different existents, through whose combination a new existent emerges [in the mind,] which you know while it remains non-existent in concreto. It [the new existent in the mind] serves as a copy (mithl) for the non-existent. Your knowledge therefore is only your vision's relation to that existent and to that reality (haqlqa.) *

Therefore, man's knowledge of a griffin is possible, because all the

parts which constitute a griffin exist sporadically in different existents, and unlike the case of the absolute non-existent such as the partner of God, one can combine all the constituent parts, and the copy of a griffin thus created in the mind becomes the object of knowledge.

So far, man's knowledge of non-existents is discussed. However, as we have explained above, God does not have the perceptive knowledge of contingents. From the point of view of God, all contingents are non-existents.- Therefore, His knowledge of contingents must operate on the same principle as man's knowledge of non-existents in concreto. In the following passage, Ibn 'Arabi explains God's knowledge of man and the universe, and it is here that Ibn 'Arabi introduces the homo Imago Dei motif.

You should know that but for the fact that man exists in the image ('ala al-siira,) knowledge would not relate itself to him eternally (azalan,) because knowledge which relates itself to a temporal thing (al-hadith) eternally occurs and continues to occur only through the eternally existing image (al-sura al-mawjudah al-qadima) in which man is created.

And the entire universe is created in the image of man.

Therefore the universe also exists in the image in which man is created.

Although the above passage is somewhat enigmatic, it is clear that here the homo imago Dei motif is supplemented by the mundus imago hominis motif. God's eternal knowledge is related to the eternally existing image, which is nothing but the image of Himself. Although God does not have any perceptive knowledge of man and the universe, God's knowledge of them is possible through His knowledge of His image, because both man and the universe are created in His image. Thus we can conclude that the sole object of God's universal knowledge, the undifferentiated in which He can perceive the differentiated, is this "eternally existing image," i.e., His image. The above thought of Ibn 'Arabi that God

knows only His image is actually very near to Ibn Sina's thought that God knows particular existents by knowing Himself. Indeed, Ibn 'Arabi states this identity of God's self-knowledge with His knowledge of the universe more explicitly in the : Uqlat al-Mustawfiz. And the *imago Dei* hadith is used in this context.

God knew Himself, then knew the universe. Therefore the universe came out in the image, and God created man as a noble compendium, in which He united the concepts (ma'an) of the greater world, and He made man a copy (nuska) which unites both what lies in the greater world and the Divine Names which are in the Divine Presence. Concerning this, the Prophet said, "God created Adam in His image." For this reason, we say that the universe came out in the image.

In the *Insha' al-Dawa'ir*, the theory of self-knowledge is stated in a more general and ambiguous manner:

It is necessary that every knower without any exception and specification be an existent both in his mind (ft nafsihi) and in concreto, being a knower of himself and a perceiver of himself. Every other object of knowledge either exists in his [a knower's] image (c ala suratihi,) in which case he [a knower] is a mithl [paradigm/copy] of it [that object of knowledge,] or exists in some part of his image. In this way, one becomes a knower of the objects of one's knowledge, because he is a knower of himself. And this self-knowledge governs the objects of knowledge

The whole passage is unfortunately very obscure. One of the reasons for this obscurity is that Ibn 'Arabi here makes a vague general statement intentionally, so that it could be applied to both God's and man's knowledge. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze this passage in both cases separately.

First, when we apply the above passage to God's knowledge, his

thought is as follows: God is a knower of Himself, a perceiver of Himself. Therefore, the first object of His knowledge is Himself. All objects of knowledge other than Himself either exist in His image entirely or in some part of His image. In the light of the homo imago Dei motif and mundus imago hominis motif, the object of knowledge which exists entirely in His image must be both man and the universe. However, this thought sounds strange. It is because in the case of God's knowledge, "copy" is obviously not an adequate translation of *mithl*. As was pointed out before, the exact meaning of *mithl* is the object of knowledge existing in the mind of the knower. In the case of man, *mithl* depends on sense-perception of the existent in *concreto*. On the other hand, in the case of God's eternal knowledge, the object of knowledge does not depend on *sehse*-perception; on the contrary it is clearly stated that from the point of view of God, existence in knowledge precedes existence in *concreto*. Thus, in the case of God's knowledge, the best translation of the term *mithl* is "paradigm, model," and in this sense, it comes very close to the Platonic Idea (*mithal*.)

When we translate the term *mithl* by "paradigm," the above passage means that God Himself is the model and paradigm of man and the universe. On the other hand, we know from the previous passage that God's

sole object of knowledge is "the eternally existing image." Therefore the model of man and the universe is nothing else but the eternally existing image of God. As we have seen in the first section, this is the familiar doctrine in the Judeo-Christian tradition of the theology of the image. Also in Gnosticism and the early Christian fathers, the term *eikon* is used in both ways: the heavenly *Urmensch* in Gnosticism and Christ the *Logos* in Christianity are called *eikon* in the meaning of "model, original," and also the earthly man is called *eikon* in the meaning of "copy" of the heavenly *Urmensch* or the *Logos*. In the same manner, Ibn 'Arabi calls man who is created in His image *mithl* (copy.) In other words, the image of God is a paradigm, model (*mithl*) of man, and man is a copy (*mithl*) of His image. Ibn 'Arabi writes: " *mithl* is man, and also it is the image in which he is created ."

In this way, Ibn 'Arabi interprets Ibn Sina's thought that God

only knows Himself as "God knows His Image." As he follows Ibn SIna in his assertion that God's self-knowledge, that is, His knowledge of His image, is identical with His knowledge of particulars, that is, His knowledge of man and the universe.

Lastly, as for the objects of knowledge which exist in some part of His image, they must be particular existents in the universe. They are known through the differentiated which God perceives in the undifferentiated, that is, in His image, though He does not have any direct perception of them.

The above argument is basically Ibn 'Arabi's modification of Ibn Sina's doctrine of God's self-knowledge. However, Ibn 'Arabi emphasizes that the above modus operandi of knowledge is not only applicable to God, but also to man. In other words, he tries to establish that in the case of man, too, self-knowledge is identical with his knowledge of the universe. It is interesting to note that Ghazzall pointed out the absurdity of Ibn Sina's doctrine of the self-knowledge of God by applying it to human knowledge.

Is God's knowledge of all the species and genera, whose number is unlimited, identical with His self-knowledge, or not?

... but if you say that it is identical, why should you not . have yourself classed with one who claims that man's knowledge of what is other than himself is identical with his self-knowledge and with his essence? And he who makes this statement must be a fool .

However, it is this -"foolish" statement that Ibn 'Arabi is making here.

Because of the parallelism between the homo imago Dei motif and the mundus imago hominis motif, the application of the doctrine of self-knowledge to man seems easy. Since the entire universe is created in the image of man, the object of knowledge which exists in his whole

image must be the entire universe. Therefore man is the model and paradigm of the universe. The objects of knowledge which exist in some part

of his image must be particular existents of the universe, for the image in which the universe is created must contain every particular existent in the universe. Thus, like God, man can know all the particular existents of the universe contained in his image by knowing his image. If man is the model of the universe, particular existents contained in his image must also be models of particular existents in concreto. He can know models of particular existents contained in his image only by perceiving and knowing his image.

But here a difficulty arises. The above thought is apparently contradictory to his previous empiricist view that from the point of view of man, existence in concreto precedes existence in knowledge. As we have already pointed out, in the case of man's knowledge mithl should be interpreted as "copy," not as "model, paradigm." This basic difference between God's knowledge and man's knowledge seems to disappear, and they become completely identical. Although Ibn 'Arabi does not solve this contradiction explicitly, it seems that he alluded to the solution in his distinction between undifferentiated knowledge and differentiated knowledge. On the basis of this distinction, his solution should be as follows: although the object of knowledge in the mind of man, that is, his image in which the universe is created, contains all the particulars of the phenomenal universe potentially, it is still not yet differentiated. Only when one sees a tree in concrete, for instance, through this tree, is the undifferentiated in his mind differentiated. To use his own expression, man can know the undifferentiated, that is, his image differentiated only through the temporal particular existents in the phenomenal universe.

Now that we have examined his doctrine , of self-knowledge, we can understand the commonness of knowledge between God and man more clearly.

Man's knowledge of his image, the undifferentiated, is nothing else but "the reality of realities," i.e., the undifferentiated knowledge of God.

This is the true meaning of his description of man as the synthesis of all the realities of the universe. However, unlike God, man cannot differentiate the realities inherent in him except through sense-perception of particular existents in concreto. Ibn 'Arabi writes:

This [the reality of realities] is the universal mother to all the existents, and it is intelligible in the mind, but not existent in concreto ... it is in existents as a reality which is neither divided, nor increased, nor diminished. Its existence is from the emergence of particular existents, both eternal and temporal. If it were not for concrete existents, we would not comprehend it, for if it were not for them, we would not comprehend the realities of existents. Although its existence depends on the existence of individuals, the knowledge of individuals in a differentiated way depends on the knowledge of it, since whoever does not know it cannot distinguish among existents. We would say, for instance, that inorganic things, angels, and the eternal are one and the same thing, since one does not know realities, and thus one does not know with what he can distinguish existents from each other.

Thus, in the case of man's knowledge of the universe, realities inherent in him and existents in concreto are interdependent; we could not comprehend realities differentially if it were not for existents in concreto, but we could not really know existents in concreto if the realities of the universe were not inherent in us beforehand, albeit undifferentiatedly.

So far we have seen how Ibn 'Arabi combined the homo imago Dei motif with the doctrine of self-knowledge. However, although in the above account the identification of man's self-knowledge and his knowledge of the universe is established, another important element in the doctrine of self-knowledge, namely the Delphic motif [the identification of man's self-knowledge and his knowledge of God] is lacking. In the following passage, he succinctly combines the homo imago Dei motif, the doctrine of self-knowledge, and the Delphic motif. This passage can be said to

be the most subtle and elaborate treatment of the *Imago Dei* motif.

If someone exists in the image of something, then this something is also in his image, so that by the single act of seeing one's own image, he sees the one who exists in his image

(man huwa 'ala suratihi,) and by the single act of knowing himself, he knows the one who exists in his image (man huwa z ala suratihi.) 1

The above passage is, like the previous passage, expressed in such general terms that it can be applied to both God and man. In the case of God, the first part of the passage alludes to the *Imago Dei* hadith.

But Ibn 'ArabI goes further and suggests that as man exists in the image of God, so does God in the image of man. Since the image of God and that of man are the same, by the single act of seeing His own image. He sees man who is created in His image and the universe which is in turn created in man's image. By the single act of knowing Himself, He knows both man and the universe.

In the case of man this passage can be interpreted in two ways, that is, with respect to man's relation to the universe, and to God, because of man's intermediary position between God and the universe. And these two interpretations are possible due to the ambiguity of the phrase man huwa c ala suratihi which allows two different translations. With respect to man's relation to the universe, the phrase must be translated as in the above quotation. The universe exists in the image of man, and man in the image of the universe, and because of this correspondence, man's self-knowledge amounts to his knowledge of the universe. However, as was pointed out previously, man's detailed knowledge of the universe needs existents in concreto in the universe. Therefore, it would be more adequate to say in the case of man that his knowledge of the universe amounts to his knowledge of himself.

In the second respect, namely in man's relation to God, the phrase must be translated by "(he sees/knows) the one in whose image he exists." Then the whole passage means the identification of man's

knowledge of himself with his knowledge of God. If we combine the above two cases, we can conclude that man's knowledge of the universe amounts to his knowledge of himself, and this self-knowledge is nothing else but his knowledge of God. In this way, man's knowledge of the universe, of himself, and of God coincide.

In this section, we have seen how his epistemology uses the *Imago Dei* motif. We can schematize the relation between God, man, and the universe as follows:

God

The Image (model)— (= the object of self-knowledge)

Man (copy) The image (model)-> The Universe (= the object of (copy) self-knowledge)

Theory of the Divine Names

As we have seen in the first part, Adam, the symbol of man, is characterized by Ibn 'Arabi as the synthesis of the Divine Names and the realities of the universe. Since we have examined the meaning of the synthesis of the realities of the universe in the previous section, in this section we would like to clarify the function of the Names of God in his metaphysics and elucidate what Ibn 'Arabi meant by the "synthesis of the Divine Names."

First of all, Ibn 'Arabi interprets the image of God in the *Imago Dei* hadlth as the Names of God. In the *Fusus al-Hikam*, he writes:

For this reason, he [the Prophet] said concerning the creation of Adam, who is the exemplar (barnamaj) which unites the descriptions (nu c ut) of the Divine Presence (hadra ilShiya that is, the Essence (dhat,) the Attributes (sifat,) and the Actions (af'al,) "God created Adam in His image." And

His image is nothing but the Divine Presence.

From the above quotation it is clear that the image in which Adam was created is the Divine Presence, whose descriptions are the Essence, the Attributes, and the Actions. These are the three classes of the Divine Names. Thus, like in Ghazzali, the Divine Presence means the domain of the Divine Names. Also in another part of the *Fusus al-Hikam*, Ibn 'Arabi states clearly that the image of God comprises the Names of God. In *al-Futuhat al-Makkhya*, the identification of the Image of God with the Divine Names is stated in the following way:

All the Divine Names are bound to him [man=Adam] without one single exception. Thus, Adam came out in the image of the Name Allah, because this name comprises all the Divine Names.

The origin of this identification seems to go back to Shibli. And as we have seen in Ruzbihan Baqli and Ghazzali, the *Imago Dei* hadith was always interpreted as the commonness of the names between man and God. As Abu al-Qasim al-Gorgani, Ghazzali's teacher in Sufism, said, all the ninety-nine Names of God are applicable also to man , Sometimes this commonness is thought to be an indication of man's moral obligation to imitate the godly character, as we have seen in Ghazzali. This thought is not lacking in Ibn 'Arabi. In *al-Tadblr~at al-Ilahiya*, he writes:

It is necessary for this vicegerent to imitate the Names of the One who appointed him as the vicegerent, so that that [i.e., the godly character] may appear in the character of his subjects and their actions.

Ibn 'Arabi says that he even composed a small treatise on the subject of the imitation of the Divine Names.

Sometimes the commonness of the names is thought to be the means to

acquire the knowledge of God. Thus, the commonness of the names provided the basis for the theory of identification of man's self-knowledge and his knowledge of God, which is suggested in the Delphic hadith.

We have already seen the elaborate theory of Ghazzali in this aspect. This thought is also not lacking in Ibn 'Arabi. In *al-Tadblrat al-Ilahlyah*, he divides the Divine Names into positive ones and negative ones, the latter indicating the Essence. As for the former, he writes as follows:

God is existent (mawjud,) and we are also existents (mawjudun,) and if there were no knowledge of our existence, we would not know the meaning of existence, in order to say that the Creator is existent. Thus, when He created in us "knowledge," we acknowledge Knowledge in God. In this way, we acknowledge Life in God through our life, and Hearing, Seeing, and Speech through our [hearing, seeing] and speech, although not through our voices, and our letters. Power, Will, and other Names of richness, generosity, goodness, forgiveness, and mercy are existent in us. When He names Himself to us with these Names, we understand them. We do not understand them except through those He created in us.

And it is in this context that the Delphic hadlth is quoted. Through the names or qualities which God created in us, we can know the meanings of the Divine Names.

Besides these traditional Sufi doctrines of the commonness of the names, the Divine Names have a cosmological function in Ibn 'ArabI. In order to understand this function, first we must examine his doctrine of the Divine Names.

Ibn 'ArabI's theory of the Divine Names is, like those of Hallaj and Ghazzall, based on the theory of the Divine Attributes of the Ash *c* arites. According to them, the Divine Attributes are neither identical with nor separate from the Divine Essence. This characteristic definition is quite suitable to the concept of the "image." As we have

seen in the Judeo-Christian tradition, the "image of God" is frequently used to express at the same time both the essential sameness with and difference from God Himself. In other words, the image of God is neither identical with nor separate from God.

First, he distinguishes the Attributes and the Names as follows. All the Attributes of God are realities, namely, the universal, intelligible concepts. Also they are called "the realities of the Divine Names"

(haqa'iq al-asma' ,) that is, the meanings which the Divine Names have and through which they distinguish themselves from each other.

Secondly, the Names of God are relations (nisab) and modes (ahffal) which are neither existent nor non-existent. In relation to God, they are identical with his Essence, therefore in God the Names are not yet differentiated, and the Name "Benefactor" (mun c im) is identical with the Name "Punisher" (mu'adhdhib .) On the other hand, in relation to the abstract concepts which they convey, that is, in relation to their "realities," they are different from each other.

Every Name indicates the Essence and the [particular] concept (ma c na) which it conveys and which it requires. With respect to its indication of the Essence, each Name comprises all other Names. With respect to its indication of the [particular] concept through which it is distinguished, it is different from other Names . . . The Name is identical with the Named with respect to the Essense; it is not identical with the Named with respect to the special concept which it conveys.

However, this differentiation of the Names remains potential in God; only through the creation of the universe are they actually differentiated, since these Names are meaningless without the universe: the Name "Creator" requires the existence of a creature and the Name "Forgiver" requires the existence of the forgiven. In this sense, the Divine Names are the agents of the creation of the universe. God Himself does not need the universe, it is the desire of the Divine Names to manifest

themselves in the universe and differentiate themselves from each other which made God create the universe.

God relieved the Divine Names from the distress in which they found themselves because of the non-manifestation of their effects .

Thus this phenomenal universe is the manifestation of the Divine Names, and every existent in the universe is the manifestation of God's particular Names. Also in the *Insha' al-Dawa'ir*, he writes:

When we inquire which force operates in this universe, we find that it is the Beautiful Names who manifested themselves (zaharat) in this universe completely and entirely. These Names realized themselves in this universe through their effects (athar) and predication (ahkam,) not through their essences (dhawat,) but through their copies (amttial,) not through their realities (haqa'iq,) but through their subtle bonds (raqa'iq .) S

The terms "predication" and "copies" suggest the Divine Names' function as Platonic Ideas, which are the objects of predication and paradigms of earthly existents. It is in this meaning that he says that the universe is created in the image of God.

We have discussed in the previous section the concept of realities in Ibn 'Arabi. Here, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between the Divine Names and the realities. In *al-FutDhat al-Makklya* it is said that every reality has a corresponding Name of God. However, it is not very clear what Divine Name corresponds to the reality of woodness, for instance. In the *Insha' al-Dawa'ir*, Ibn 'Arabi suggests that the reality of realities as a whole is God's Attribute of Knowledge. And thus it corresponds to the Name "Knower." On the other hand, as we have seen, the realities are universals, and like the theory of universals in Ibn Sina, the realities have three modes of existence. First they are eternally in the mind of God as His knowledge, secondly they are manifest in particular existents in the universe, and

thirdly, in man's mind as his knowledge. In the mind of God, they are not yet differentiated, and only through the universe are they differentiated, and the realities in the mind of God are the paradigms and models of particular existents in the universe. Thus functionally the realities in the mind of God can be interpreted as the Names of God. In other words, the reality of woodness eternally existing in the mind of God is one of the Divine Names. In this way, man as the synthesis of all the realities of the universe expresses the same thing as man as the synthesis of all the Divine Names. The universals inherent in man are in relation to God the manifestations of the Divine Names and in relation to the universe the realities of the universe.

Although the universe as a whole is the perfect manifestation of all the Divine Names, in each existent of the universe except man, they are not manifest in their entirety, because no existent has all the realities. For instance, a white dog has the reality of dogness and the reality of whiteness, but does not have the reality of woodness. However, only in man are all the Divine Names manifest, because man as a microcosm has all the realities of the universe within him. And because of these realities, only man among all existents can know all the existents of the universe.

Anthropocentrism

In Ibn 'Arabi, man is the link which connects the Divine Names still unmanifested, that is, the realities of the universe still undifferentiated and the differentiated, particular existents of the universe. The Divine Names need man in order to be fully differentiated in the universe, because man's knowledge of the universe through the realities inherent in him is essential to the differentiation of the universe.

Ibn 'Arabi seems to think that, if man were not in the universe, a tree would not even be a tree, and a mountain not a mountain. In the beginning of the Fusus al-Hikam, he compares the universe before the creation of man to an unpolished mirror, a kind of *materia prima*, a soundless, colorless, shapeless world. Only through man is the universe

polished and able to reflect the image of God. Furthermore, man is compared to the pupil (insan) of the eye through which God sees His creation. The purpose of the creation is God's desire to see Himself outside Himself, and this is only achieved through man. In this sense, man is the image of the Image of God, the mirror in which the Image of God is most perfectly reflected.

The anthropocentrism of Ibn 'Arabi is most explicitly stated in the following words from the *Insha' al-Dawa'ir* .

Man has absolute perfection both in eternity and in temporality. God has the absolute perfection in eternity, but He has no access to temporality, since He is too exalted. The universe has absolute perfection in temporality, but it has no access to eternity, since it is too low for it.

God cannot have direct contact with the created universe, except through man. But man has correspondences both to God through His Names, and the universe through its realities. Of course, it is not meant that man is in any sense superior to God, because it is God's absolute transcendence which prevents Him from enjoying the perfection in temporality, but still it is not God but man who is the center of all the existents. And this absolute perfection of man is symbolized by Ibn 'Arabi with the phrase "the Perfect Man."

CHAPTER II

MICROCOSM AND MACROCOSM IN ISLAMIC THOUGHT

In the previous chapter, we have investigated the development of Adam speculation in Islam, and we have found that in several interpretations of the *Imago Dei* hadith, the macrocosm-microcosm motif is connected with it. In this chapter we focus on this motif in Islam, especially the macrocosm doctrine of the *Ikhwan al-Safa'*, and show their influences on Ghazzali and Ibn 'Arabi.

The macrocosm-microcosm motif has a long history. Rudolf Allers in his interesting survey of this motif in Western philosophy distinguished six variations: elementar.istic; structural; holistic; symbolistic; psychological; and metaphorical. Although all the six variations are found in Islamic thought, we deal in this chapter with the first five variations. Also we must not forget the following words of Allers after his classification. "It is rare that any of these interpretations, with the exception of the last named [i.e., metaphorical,] is found in pure form. The usual thing is to encounter a number of various combinations. The single interpretations mingle and overlap."

Origin of the Microcosm Theory in Islamic Thought

It is most plausible that the macrocosm-microcosm motif was brought into Islam with Pythagoreanism. ShahrastanI in his al-Milal wa al- . Nihal transmits the following words of Pythagoras.

Man stands in correspondence to (muqabala) the entire universe by virtue of his natural disposition (fitra,) and he is a microcosm (c alam saghrl,) and the universe is a big man (ins an kablr.) Therefore his luck (hazz) pertaining to the soul and the intellect became more ample (awfar.) Thus, whoever improves the soul and refines the character and purifies his conditions (ahwal) can reach the knowledge of the universe and the manner (kayflya) of its composition.

It must be noted in this connection that the Ikhwan al-Safa', who developed the most elaborate macrocosm-microcosm theory in Islam, is generally recognized as the representative of Muslim Neo-Pythagoreanism.

The first who developed this motif in Islam is Kindi. He also admits that it is the ancient sages of foreign origin (lit. the people who are not of our language, ghayr ahl lisana) who called man the microcosm. Then he continues as follows:

In him [man,] there are all the forces (quwa) which exist in the universe (al-kull ,) namely, growth (nama' ,) animality (hayawanlya,) and rationality (mantiqiya.) In him there is

earthness (ardlya) like bones and similar things; wateryness (ma'Iya) like the moistures (rutubat) which exist in it like veins and liquid-filled parts (naqa of veins, the stomach, the bladder and other similar parts; the fixed minerals (al~ma c adin al-mabniya) and gum (samgha) like the brain and nerves; and air within his interior and hollow parts; fire like the innate heat; plants like his hair; animals like worms generating in his interior and outside. Natural phenomena similar to those which take place in the sublunary sphere like rain, thunder, wind, eclipse, rainbow, earthquake and so forth, all have similar things in him, . . . And only in man are found all these things in their entirety.

The correspondences which are enumerated in the above passage reappear in the Ikhwan al-Safa', Ghazzall, and Ibn 'Arabi. In the above passage, it is said that all the three forces which exist in the universe are also found in man. Growth is the characteristic of the plant, animality that of animals, and rationality that of angels. Therefore man comprises plantness, animality, and angelic nature.

His concept of man as the microcosm is closely connected with the motif of self-knowledge. In al-Risala fi Hudid al-Ashya' wa Rusumitia, he gives six definitions of "philosophy." The one which seems to represent his own idea runs as follows:

Philosophy is man's knowledge (ma'-rifa) of himself. This saying is extremely noble and profound. For example, I say:

Things (ashya') are either bodies or non-bodies; what are non-bodies are either substances (jawahir) or accidents; man consists of the body, the soul, and the accidents; the soul is a substance and a non-body; if man knows himself (lit. his essence, dhatahu,) he knows the body with his accidents, the first accident and the substance which is non-body. Consequently if he knows all this, he knows everything. For this, the sages called man the microcosm.

Like all the Neo-Platonists, Kindi separates the body and the soul sharply. The soul is of divine nature. However, the relation between God and the soul is not explained through the *Imago Dei* hadith, but through the metaphor of the sun and the sunshine. He even compares the soul to God. Just as God directs the universe, so the soul directs the body. The same comparison is used by Ghazzali in *al-Madnun al-Saghir*, as we have seen in the previous chapter.

Microcosm Theory of the Ikhwan al-Safa

Kindi's idea of the microcosm found the most eager supporter in the Ikhwan al-Safa'. As Conger pointed out, they developed the most elaborate doctrine of the macrocosm-microcosm before Paracelsus and they put this doctrine at the center of their whole philosophical system. It is no exaggeration to say that their whole cosmology and anthropology are based on this idea, and their influence is extensive on later Islamic thought.

The Theory of the Soul

According to the Ikhwan, all existents are divided into the universal (*al-kulll*) and the particular (*Cal-juz'l*) thus the soul is also divided into the universal and the particular soul. The former, which is called also "the *anima mundi*" (*nafs al-'alam*) is the third from God in the successive chain of emanation, just like the famous triad of Plotinus. Partial souls (*nufits* or *anfus juz'Iya*,) among which are human souls, are faculties of the universal soul. The universal soul governs the whole universe in the same manner as the human soul governs the whole body, although, in the case of the universal soul, it is outside the universe.

Sometimes particular souls are further classified in the hierarchical order into simple souls (*anfus baslta*,) the souls of the genera the souls of the species; and particular souls, i.e., the souls of individuals. They explain their relations by comparing them to the numerical system. The universal soul is like the unit, i.e., the number one, the

simple souls are like digits; the souls of the genera, tens; the souls of species, hundreds; the particular souls, thousands. Elsewhere, they explain the lower souls as the functions (*quwa*) of the higher soul(s) in the following way.

When we say "the simple souls," we mean by it the faculties of the universal soul, which moves these bodies [heavenly bodies,] directs and permeates them. We call these faculties in our writing the angels and the spiritual beings (*ruhaniyun* .) When we say "the animal souls, the plant souls and the mineral souls" (*al anfus al hayawanlya wa al-nabatlya wa al-ma'-daniya* ,) we mean by these the faculties of the simple souls, which move these generated bodies (*al-ajsam al-muwallada* , i.e., the mineral, the plant, and the animal,) direct and permeate them . . . When we say "the moving particular souls" (*al-anfus al-juz'lya al-mutaharrika* ,) we mean by these the faculties of the animal souls, plant souls, and mineral souls, which permeate the particular bodies [i.e., individual,] move and direct them.

In the above passage, the animal souls, the plant souls, and the mineral souls correspond to the souls of the genera, while the souls of the species are missing. Also, as is clear from the above passage, the simple souls are the souls of heavenly bodies, and they are identical with angels.

Although the soul of the human genus is not mentioned in the above passage, it is nevertheless the highest of all the souls of the genera, and is called "the universal, human rational soul" (*al-nafs al-natiqa al ins'anlya al kullya* .) The term appears in the famous controversy between the animals and man before the King of the Jinn, which occupies a large part in the middle of the *Rasa'il*. Here the sage of the Jinn speaks of the angels which guard and guide animals.

There is no genus of animals nor species nor individual, whether it be large or small, in charge of whom God did not put angels who educate, preserve, and supervise them in all

their behavior. And this is the greatest mercy, kindness and affection from the side of the parents toward their small children and their weak issues.

The angels of the animals in the above passage are the souls of the genera, species and individuals of animals. All the particular souls are, if separately considered, angels of the particular things which they move and direct. In other words, they can be said to be the guardian angels of particular things, although generally the Ikhwan use the term "angels" for the souls of the heavenly bodies. Then the King asks him who is the leader (ra'is) of the angels (muqarrabun) who are in charge of human beings and preserve them and supervise their affairs. The sage answers.

It is the universal, human, rational soul which is the vicegerent of God on earth. It was connected with the body of Adam, when he was created from dust, and to him all the angels prostrated themselves altogether. They [i.e., angels] are the animal souls who submit themselves in obedience toward the rational soul (al-nafs al-natiqa) which remains up to our time in the descendants of Adam, just as the physical shape of the body (sura al-jasad al-jismanlya) remains in his descendants up to our time. With it they grow and develop, succeed, are rewarded and admonished and to it they return . . . , and with it they enter Paradise, and with it they ascend to the world of the heavens ('-alarn al-aflak,) I mean the ascension of the rational soul who is the vicegerent of God on earth .

The universal, human, rational soul is the guardian angel of human beings in the same sense that the animal souls are guardian angels of animals. It is the generic soul of man, and when it is connected with individual bodies of man, it becomes the rational soul in man. Yves Marquet interprets this "universal, human, rational soul" as the celestial Adam of the Isma'ilihs. Although it is called "the vicegerent of God on earth," and the prostration of the angels is mentioned, there is no dichotomy of the celestial Adam and the terrestrial Adam, nor any

myth of the fall of the celestial Adam, both of which exist in Isma'iliism. The Ikhwan use the Qur'anic Adam only as a symbol of the generic soul of man.

According to Yves Marquet, there is still another term which refers to the celestial Adam. This is "the form of forms" (sura al-suwar) which appears in the section, "On the Explanation (bayan) of What Is Known through the Principles (awa'il) of Intellects," in the first epistle of the Fourth Book. In this section, the Ikhwan try to explain why men are different in their intellectual ability. One of the reasons they mention is as follows.

All the characteristics (khisal) and virtues (manaqib) cannot be gathered in one single individual. Because of this, they are scattered (furriqat) in all the individuals (ashr ktias) of human being (insan) with their multiplicity. However they [individuals] never go outside the form (sura) of the human being, which is one of the forms under the sphere of the moon, and the form of forms (sura al-suwar.) Because of this, you see him [man] in perfect equilibrium (i'-tidal) in the condition of his innate nature (fitra.) Then his good and evil habits ('adat) remove him from this [original equilibrium,] and they become his [second] nature . . . Know that this form [of forms] is the vicegerent of God on earth governing the animals, the plants, and the minerals . . . This is the unitary form, even though its individuals are many. The control (hukm) of this form over all the individual men is like the control of the form of the soul (sura nafsihi) over all the members of the body of one single man. This [the form of the soul] governs each member, each joint, each sense of his entire body from the day of birth to the day of separation [i.e., death.] In this manner, this form [of forms] governs all individuals of the human being (bashar,) both ancestors (awwalln) and descendants (akharln) from the day God created heavens and earth. And Adam made of dust (turabl,) the father of the human being, has the control and predominance (rubublyya) in everything which is on earth to the day of the

Resurrection. "And all the angels prostrated themselves altogether." [.]

The "form of forms" can be interpreted as the generic form of man. It is the form of man in the Aristotelian sense, that is "humanity," which is individualized in each man. And this is also identical with the "universal, human, rational soul" as Y. Marquet thought-.

The above contrast between the generic form or soul of man versus individual men is expressed by the Ikhwan with the set of terms, "universal, absolute man" (insan mutlag kulll) and "particular man"

(ins an juz'i.) Some scholars have considered the term insan kulll as the origin of Ibn 'Arabi's term, insan kamil. The set of terms appears in the section "On the Essence of the Character" in the ninth epistle of the First Book. Here, they first explain that there are two types of character: the innate (markuza) and the acquired (muktasaba.) Each individual man has his own peculiar character, but none is endowed with all the characters.

If one single man were characterized by all the characters, there would be no trouble (kulfa) for him to manifest all the actions and all the crafts. However, [the universal, absolute man] is characterized by receiving all the characters and manifestations of all the actions and crafts, but "the particular man" is not. Know that all men are individuations of this absolute man. This absolute man is what we pointed out as being the vicegerent of God on earth since the day of the creation of Adam, Father of the human being, to the day of the Resurrection. And this is the universal, human soul existing in every individual, just as God said, "We did not create nor resurrect in no wise but as one single soul" [.]

The similarity of the above passage to the passage of the "form of forms" is obvious. Here, "the absolute man" is called "the universal human soul," which is the same as "the universal, human, rational soul." Therefore Nyberg's and Abd al-Latif's identification of the "absolute man" with the universal soul, i.e., the anima mundi, on the basis of the

above passage is unfounded.

However, a very similar set of terms, "The universal, virtuous man" (insan kulll fadil) and "the particular man" appears in the Risala al-Jami'-a, but they are used in a different sense. As already pointed out by S. H. Nasr, here the former term refers to the supralunar spheres, that is, the "spiritual, luminous, noble world" (c alam ruhani sharlf nuranl,) and the latter refers to the sublunar world.

Like Kindi and other Neo-Platonists, they claim the strict dichotomy of the body and the soul. Their union is unfortunate and temporary. It is the goal of man to free the soul from the body and the material world. However, as it is, man is the synthesis (majmu c) of the soul and the body: "Man is the compound whole (jumla murakkaba) of the visible, outer body and the hidden, inner spiritual soul." They explain the relation between the two through various metaphors; the house and the inhabitant, the rind and the core, the fruit and the tree, the rider and the horse. Although between the two, the soul is certainly the nobler part of man, both the body and the soul occupy special high rank among the existents.

While man is the most perfect of the creatures and the most complete of the beings which are under the moon, and although his body is only a part of the entire universe, this part is the most similar thing to the whole, the soul of man is also most similar among the particular souls to the universal soul, -which is the anima mundi.

Thus man is the most perfect among the creatures under the moon. And often they quote the Qur'anic verse, "We created man in the best stature." (/); e.g.:

The creator created man in the best condition and formed him as the perfect form (sura) and made his form the mirror for Himself, so that the form of the greater world may be reflected in it.

Man, who is the synthesis of the soul and the body, is also the intermediary between the synthesis of the higher and the lower worlds.

The human form (sura insaniya,) human constitution (khilqa basharlya) with which rational souls (nufus natiqa) and the intellectual faculties (quwa c aqila) are connected is the intermediary between these two worlds [i.e., the supralunar and the sublunar.] It is connected with the spiritual world through the rational soul and the intellectual faculty, and with the world of particulars (c Zlam juz'i,) the lower center (markaz safll) through natural matter (hayitla tabl'lya) and bodily form (sura jismanlya.) Therefore, we say that it is the synthesis (majmu C J of the two worlds.

Not only man, but also the human soul itself occupies the middle rank (al-rutba al-wusta) among the existents. The existents which are higher than the human soul are the Creator, the Intellect, and the angels who are pure forms devoid of matter (al-suwar al-mujarrada min al-hayula.) In another place they — like Ghazzali — place man in the middle rank between the angel and the animal, although it is possible for man to reach the rank of angels by purifying his soul.

Self-Knowledge in the Ikhwan al-Safa'

The motif of self-knowledge which we have analyzed in the previous chapter also occurs very frequently in the Ikhwan. However, while in the previous chapter we have treated the concept of self-knowledge as the knowledge of God, the Ikhwan's main emphasis is on self-knowledge as the knowledge of the universe, and in this way it is closely related to the microcosm-macrocosm theory. The idea of self-knowledge as the knowledge of God appears only twice in the Rasa'il. Once it appears in the answer of the animal against man's boasting of skillful engineers and land surveyors. The animal retorts to man that these sciences are not necessary, what is more important is the knowledge of his own body, and quotes the hadlth, "Whoever knows himself knows his Lord." In

the second case, the Ikhwan affirm that the final aim of natural sciences is the divine sciences (culum ilahlya.) The first level of these divine sciences is the knowledge of the substance (jawhar) of the soul, and the search for its origin and its primordial condition before its attachment to the body and the investigation into its future destiny after death. There is no road for man to reach the knowledge of his Lord except after he knows his soul (himself.) And they quote the hadlth, "Whoever knows himself knows his Lord,"

As we have seen in the preceding section, the soul must be purified in this world to free itself from the contamination of the body. The purification is possible only through knowledge. As in Gnosticism, knowledge itself is the salvation. And the knowledge which liberates man is knowledge of the soul. However, knowledge of the soul can only be attained by man's knowing his body.

The Significance of Man's Creation as the Microcosm

It must be noted that when the Ikhwan say that man is the microcosm, generally they mean the body of man. This means that the human body con

tains the phenomenal universe, including the heavenly bodies. It is because of the wisdom of God that He created man's body as the microcosm, so that man can obtain all the knowledge of the universe by knowing his body. This educational purpose of God is clearly stated in the following.

God knows that the universe is large and big, and it is not within the power of man to go around the world, so that he may see it entirely, due to the shortness of the life and the length of age of the world. Thus He saw with His wisdom and He created for him a microcosm summarizing the great world.

And He formed (sawwara) in the microcosm everything which exists in the great world.

The Ikhwan explain the above educational purpose of God in the form of a parable, which is strangely reminiscent of Campanella's The City of

the Sun and the medieval *ars memoria*. A wise king had small sons, and wanted to educate them properly before they were to be received in his court, because only those of refined character and manners were fitting to his court. So the king built a strong castle for them and assigned to each one of them a room and wrote down around the room all the sciences which he wanted them to learn, and through which he wanted them to refine their character. And he ordered his sons, saying "Look at what I

painted for you before you. Read what I have written in it for your sake, and contemplate what I explained for you, and think over them, so that you may know their meanings and thus become wise, good, virtuous, and pious." It seems that the paintings and writings on the wall were arranged in six levels. On the highest level astronomical science is painted; on the second level geographical and geological sciences are painted; on the third level, the medical, biological, and mineral sciences are painted and described; on the fourth level, knowledge of crafts, professions, and agriculture are described, and cities and markets are painted to explain business transactions and commerce; and in the last level, the sciences of politics are written. Then, the Ikhwan explain the metaphors: the wise king is God, his children are the human beings (*insaniya*), the castle he built is the entire universe, the rooms are the human shapes (*sura al-insan*.) The kinds of knowledge which are painted are the marvelous composition of his body. The knowledge which is formed in it (*mutakawwana*) is the faculties of the soul and its kinds of knowledge.

As was pointed out, in the Ikhwan's microcosm-macrocosm theory, the main emphasis is put more on the correspondences between the human body and the universe. The powers and actions of the human soul permeate the entire body (microcosm) just as the powers of the universal soul permeate the entire universe. The correspondences are very detailed and sometimes too fanciful and forced. Correspondences are manifold: thus, for instance, the same organ corresponds to various things of the universe and, vice versa, the same planet corresponds to different organs in different places. Here we can give only the most brief summary of these various types of correspondences. First, there

exist correspondences between the body and the heavens. Then also the sublunar world corresponds to the body. Here are included the four elements (arkan, or ummahat,) three kingdoms (i.e., animals, plants, minerals,) each of which finds correspondence in the human body. The meteorological phenomena and the geographical features also have their equivalents in the body. The following is a typical example.

The structure of his body is like the earth. His bones are like the mountains; the marrow in it like the minerals [ores;] his belly (jawf) like the sea; his intestines like the rivers; his veins like brooks; his flesh like the soil (turab) his hair like plants; the part where the hair grows (manbat) like the fertile land; the part where no hair grows like the salty marshland; the front part from the face to the foot like the inhabited land; his back like the ruined land (kharab,) the front part of his face like the east; his back like the west; his right hand like the south; his left hand like the north; his breath like the wind; his speech (kalam) like the thunder (ra*-d) his voices like the bolts of lightning (sawa c iq) his laughter like the noon light, his weeping like the rain; his despair and sorrow like the darkness of the night.

It is interesting to see how the medical, or "pseudo-scientific" correspondences are carried away and shift to almost poetical comparisons.

A central characteristic of the microcosm-macrocosm theory of the Ikhwan is their very frequent use of the city-state metaphor ("the holistic microcosm theory" of Allard.) Sometimes the universe and the human body are compared to the city-state. In the former case, the sun corresponds to the king. In the latter case, there are two types of comparison. In the first type, mainly the architectural structure of the city is compared to the body. This is a variation of the comparison of the body and the soul to the house and its inhabitants. In the second type, the various functionaries of the state are compared to faculties of the soul. In the first type, the intellect (c aql) is the king; in the second type, the soul. We will examine the details of this

second type of microcosm theory later in comparison with those of Ghazzali and Ibn 'Arabi.

It is most interesting to note that, at least in two places, the Ikhwan seem to indicate that it is not the individual man who contains everything in him, but it is the human being in the collective, generic sense which contains everything in the universe.

They also try to show the correspondences between various kinds of animals and man.

Then know, oh brother, that animals are many in species and every species of them has their characteristics (khasslya) which others do not have. Man shares all of them in their characteristics (khawass.)

Man is brave like the lion, cowardly like the rabbit, liberal like the chicken, stingy like the dog. In this way, they continue the list of animal qualities found in man. Then they conclude as follows:

In short, there is no animal, no mineral, no element, no plant, no constellation, no existent (mawjud) whose characteristics are not found in man, and these things which we mentioned concerning man are not found in any other species of existents in this world except in man. And because of this the sages said that Man is alone after all multiplicity just as the Creator is alone before all multiplicity.

Here man is compared to God in that both are an all-comprehensive unity, although God is before multiplicity and man after it.

Although the microcosm-theory of the Ikhwan is mainly "structural" and "holistic," the epistemological, psychological microcosm theory is not entirely lacking in them. In the third part, when they declared that man is nobler than the animal in the respect of his composition (tarklb,) they continue as follows.

In the composition of man are united all the meanings

(ma'anl) of the existents, both simple and compound, which have been already mentioned before, because man is the compound of the coarse body and the single spiritual soul.

Because of this, sages named man the microcosm and the universe the big man. When man really knows himself in terms of marvels of the composition of his body, fineness of its structure, and the manners of the actions of the powers of the soul in it, and the manifestations of the actions of the soul through it, namely firm works and perfect crafts, then he is ready to judge (yaqls) all the meanings (ma : anl) of the sensibles by analogy with it, and infer from it all the meanings of the intelligibles of the two worlds altogether.

Although in the above passage the epistemological-psychological aspect is not well developed, still the term ma'ani (meanings) is remarkable.

The Imago Dei Motif in the Ikhwan

Although the Ikhwan often affirm that man is the vicegerent of God on earth and has the best composition, quoting the Qur'an, they do not use the imago Dei hadith in this context. It seems that they did not know this motif as a hadith. The imago Dei motif is used once as a quotation from one of the revealed books, in the section "On the Action of God whose Action is through His Essence and the Attributes which are fitting to Him" in the eighth epistle of the fourth part. It is somewhat strange that the imago Dei motif is not used in the context of the macrocosm-microcosm motif, but in the context of the essence-attributes doctrine. In this section, first it is said that the intellect is the nearest to its Creator and is the action of the Creator, while it is the actor in relation to what is below it. Then they continue as follows:

Since the actor gave his image (sura) and his likeness (mithal) to his action which is special to him, and he supports it [i.e., action] through the power, for the sake of which this strength had been created over the actions that were before him, the Intellect became a place (mawdi c) for

the command (amr) of God and a locus (makan) for His power.

In some revealed books appeared the words, "God created Adam in His image and likeness," and also [in the Qur'an] the words of God, "and for Him is the highest example (al-mathal al~a*- la) in the heavens and the earth." (/; /.) Thus the sages said that in the caused (al-ma'lul) are found the traces (athar) of the cause. Thus perfect actions and perfect handicrafts began to indicate the wisdom of their creator. They are related to him, because he is described (mawsuf) by them.

In the above passage, it is somewhat ambiguous whether the "actor" refers to God or the Intellect. In the first case, Adam is the symbol of the Intellect, and in the second, the phenomenal world. Whichever may be, the *imago Dei* motif is quoted here to explain that the created things [the caused] are the indicators of their creator and his attributes .

Macrocosm-Microcosm Motif in Ghazzall

We have already noted that Ghazzall employed frequently the macrocosm-microcosm motif in connection with the interpretation of the *imago Dei* hadith. In this section, I propose to describe this motif in more detail.

In the *Imla'*, the correspondences of the macrocosm and the microcosm are stated as follows:

Whoever looks at the details of the shape (surat) of the great universe, divides it into several parts. Adam can be also divided in such a way. Each part is similar to the other. Thus the universe is divided into two parts. One part is outer, and sensible like the world of the *mulk* the second, inner and intelligible like the world of the *malakut*. Man is also divided into the outer, sensible part like the bone, flesh, blood and other kinds of sensible substances, and into

the inner part like the spirit, the intellect, the will, the power, and so forth. In another division, the universe is divisible into three worlds: the world of the mulk, which is outer for the sense; the world of the malakut, which is inner for the intellect; and the world of the jabarut, which is the middle . . . Thus, man can be divided into corresponding parts. The equivalent to the world of the mulk is the sensible parts . . . The equivalent to the world of the malakut is the spirit, the intellect, the power, the will, and so forth.

The equivalent to the world of the jabarut is the perceptions (idrakat) existing in the senses and the powers existing in its parts .

In the *Madniin al-Saghrlr*, as we have seen in the previous chapter,

Ghazzali compares God's control over the universe to that of man over his body. (Supra, p. .) Then he continues as follows.

It becomes clear that the form of the heart, as the center of the human kingdom, resembles the Throne of God; the brain resembles His Footstool , the senses resemble the angels who obey God by their nature without being able to resist Him; the nerves and the members resemble the heavens; the power of the hands resembles the servile nature localised in the bodies; the paper, the pen and ink resemble the elements (c anasir) which are the receptive matrices of union, mixture, and separation; the mirror of the imagination resembles the Well-Preserved Tablet .

The most interesting macrocosm-microcosm theory is found at the beginning of the *Klmiya-yi Sa'-adat*. This part corresponds approximately to the *Kitab Shark c Aja'ib aJ-QaJb*, in the third part of the *Ihya* . Ghazzali begins the book with the quotation of the Prophetic hadlth, "whoever knows himself knows his Lord," and the Qur'anic verse, "We will show them our signs in the horizons and in their souls" (./) Nothing is nearer to us in the universe than ourselves. Therefore, if we do not know ourselves, how can we know others? However, to know oneself

does not mean to know one's physical body, but to know what the self is, whence one came, whither one will go, why one came inside the dwelling place, for what purpose one was created, what one's happiness and misery are. Obviously knowledge of this kind is concerned with the inner self, that is, one's soul. Thus to know oneself is to know one's soul.

Then, Ghazzali asserts that inside man there are four attributes: those of cattle, predatory animals, devils and angels. The first is the attribute of concupiscence; the second, that of anger; the third, that of wicked cunningness; the fourth, that of the inner reality of man, which Ghazzali calls the heart. A little later in the section entitled "The Manner of Appearance of the Good and Bad Attributes in Man," they are listed again as the four types of human character. Concupiscence, anger, and the angelic character correspond to the Platonic division of the soul: the concupiscent; the irascible; and the rational, although the devilish character does not have its counterpart in Plato, man shares the two former characteristics with the animal. Therefore man's reality does not lie in them.

Man is nobler and more perfect than cattle and predatory animals. Perfection is given to everything, and that is the goal of its rank, and everything is created for that. For example, the horse is nobler than the donkey, because the donkey is created to carry burdens, the horse to charge in battle and the holy war . . . the power of carrying burdens is also given to the horse, like the donkey, but the additional perfection is also given to the horse, which is not given to the donkey. If the horse falls short of its own perfection, it is used as a pack-horse; it falls down to the rank of the donkey.

Although man possesses all the qualities which the animals possess, what distinguishes man from other animals is the intellect (c aql.) And because of this, man is given dominance over the universe; and Ghazzali quotes the Qur'anic verse /. However, the devilish character misuses this superior faculty of man for evil purposes, contriving plots and tricks. But it must be used to know God and His works and control

desire and anger. In this lies the real nature of man, that is the angelic attributes. Then he compares these four characters to the pig, the dog, the devil, and the angel, and says that they are all found inside the human skin. The dog and the pig are not despicable and blamable because of their outer shapes, but because of the attributes of anger and concupiscence inside them. Those people in whom concupiscence

and anger are predominant worship the pig and the dog in reality, and offer their service to them. Although they resemble a human being in respect of the outer shape, they appear in the real shape of the pig and the dog in the dream and on the day of the Resurrection.

Ghazzali asserts that man is created from the outer body and the inner meaning (ma c ni~yi batin.) The latter is called nafs (soul,) jan (spirit,) dil (heart.) Also it is said that some people call the human reality (haqlqat-i adami) ruh (spirit) and some nafs. iX We have already seen that in the Mishkat al~Anwar, Ghazzali uses ruh, nafs, c aql synonymously. This is most clearly stated in the c Aja'ib al-Qalb. Here he analyzes the terms nafs, ruh, qalb, and t-aql. Each has two meanings: one refers to the physical object, the other to the inner subtle reality of man. In the first meaning, the four words are all different, but in the latter meaning, they all refer to the same reality. And among the four, he chooses to use the term "heart" for this reality. While the terms, "spirit," "soul," "intellect" are used also in philosophy, the term "heart" belongs to the typical Sufi terminology.

Ghazzali compares the anatomical heart to the vehicle (markab) and the instrument of the real heart. Then he proceeds to the city-state metaphor. The heart is the king (padishah) of the entire body, and everything'other than the heart are his followers (taba<) his soldiers (lashkar) and servants. There are two types of soldiers: the outer and the inner. To the former belong all the organs like hands, feet, and the five outer senses; to the latter belong anger, desire and five inner senses. All these soldiers obey the order of the king faithfully.

Among them, the members of the body like hands and feet are artisans

(pishevaran) of the city; Desire, the tax-collector; Anger, the police, Reason (c agl) the minister. All these are necessary for the king to govern the kingdom properly. However, Anger and Desire must be always subjected to Reason, so if Reason becomes the prisoner of Desire and Anger, the kingdom will be ruined and the king will be destroyed.

Just like the four kinds of attributes and characters in man, the above three functionaries of the state have their origin in the Platonic tripartite division of the soul. In the Ikhwan, these three faculties of the soul are compared to the leaders of the army. And it is said that the irascible faculty must be controlled by the concupiscent faculty; the concupiscent faculty by the rational faculty (quwa riatiqa) the rational faculty by the suprahuman intellect (c aql.) If we compare the above city-body analogy of Ghazzall with that of the Ikhwan, the difference easily noticeable is that the latter emphasize more physical, medical correspondences. The King in the Ikhwan is the soul (nafs.) They also identify the soul with the spirit (ruh.)" Although in Ghazzali the heart is the king, it is equivalent to the soul as we have seen before. The minister who specializes in the management of the kingdom and the government of the subject is the "faculty of craft" (quwa al-siria*-a,) one of the five inner senses . This faculty is in charge of the writing of what is thought in the brain, and is localized in the hand and the finger . The place of "reason" or rational faculty is confused in the Ikhwan. As we have seen above, it is mentioned once as one of the Platonic tripartite divisions of the soul. In another place, the rational faculty (al-quwa al-'aqila) and the speaking faculty (al-qiwa al-natiqa) are mentioned together with the five outer senses as the seven spiritual faculties of the soul; the former corresponds to the sun and is localized in the middle of the brain, the latter to the moon . Although the qima al-natiqa usually means in philosophy the rational faculty , the Ikhwan strangely take the adjective natiqa in its literal sense "speaking," and localize it between the throat and the tongue . Both the speaking faculty and the faculty of craft are included in the five inner senses. The former is compared to the gatekeeper (hajib) and the interpreter (turjuman.) The other three are the imaginative (mutakhayyila,) the thinking (mufakkira,) and the preserving (hafiza) faculties; they are located in the front,

middle and back of the brain respectively, and correspond to the booncompanions (nudama') of the king . The thinking faculty must be identical with the rational faculty, since as is mentioned above, the latter is also localized in the middle of the brain.

Ghazzali's concept of five inner senses is more similar to that of the philosopher . As we have already mentioned, the outer senses correspond to the spies. They gather information and bring it to the imaginative faculty, which corresponds to the postmaster (sahib-e bar id.)

The preserving faculty corresponds to the one who is in charge of the letter bag (khallta-dar,) i who takes the letter of information from the postmaster, and then at the proper time reports to the minister, Reason. Although it is not mentioned here, the other three faculties are thinking (tafakkur,) memory (tadhakkur) and estimation (tawahhum .)

Although Ghazzall's main concern is with the heart and the spiritual faculties in man, at least in one section entitled "Marvels of the Wonders of God in the Human Body," he occupies himself with medical science and correspondences between the body and the universe. The correspondences mentioned here are very similar to those of the J Ikhwan.

The human body in its summary is a copy (mithal) of all the universe, and whatever is created in the universe is found inside man. The bone is like the mountain; the sweat like the rain; the hair like the tree; the brain like the sky; the senses like the stars. To enumerate these in full would take too long; but all the genera of the creation have their copy in him.

Then he compares the various physiological activities inside man to artisans; e.g. the digestive power of the stomach is compared to the cook. Then he declares that the medical knowledge of our body must also lead to the knowledge of God, that is, the knowledge of the Creator through His creation, as we have seen in the previous chapter. Finally, he states as follows:

Nothing is nearer to you than yourself. Someone who does not know himself and claims to know other things is as ruined as someone who cannot feed himself and claims that all the dervishes of the city eat his bread; that is both improper and impossible .

Macrocosm-Microcosm Theory of Ibn 'Arabi

Ibn 'Arabi uses the macrocosm-microcosm motif very often. However, as we have pointed out in the first chapter, his use of this motif is basically "epistemological." Since man can know everything in the universe, he must have everything in the universe inside him. However, the structural microcosm-macrocosm theory is not absent in Ibn 'Arabi.

In this section, we would like to analyze the structural macrocosm-microcosm theory in Ibn 'Arabi.

In this sense the most interesting work is *al-Tadbirat al-Ilahiya fl Islah al-Mamlaka al-Insanlya*. The entire book is modelled on Pseudo-Aristotle's *The Secret of Secrets*, which deals with the art of governing the state. In this book, Ibn 'Arabi teaches us how to govern the body, which is considered the kingdom. The book is one of the most detailed anthropological treatises of Ibn 'Arabi, and the macrocosm-microcosm motif is predominant all through the book.

In the beginning of the book, he expounds the general correspondences between the macrocosm and the microcosm: what grows in the universe corresponds to the hair and the nail; the four kinds of water (briny, sweet, rotten, bitter) to the water of the eyes, mouth, nose, and ear respectively. Just as the universe is created from the four elements (earth, water, air, fire,) so is the human body created from these four elements. The four winds (i.e., winds from four directions) correspond to the four physiological faculties (i.e., the sucking, the holding, the digestive, the rejecting.) The animals and devils correspond to bad qualities, angels to good qualities of man. Just as in the world there are invisible and visible parts, in man there are the outside and the inside: the former is the world of the sense, i.e., the *mulk* the latter

the world of the heart, i.e. the malakut .

As Ibn 'Arabi himself admits, these correspondences are in reality metaphors and similes (isti'arat wa al-majaz. ,) The following quotation from al-Futuhat al-Makklya clearly shows the method of analogy,

Man is in reality a comprehensive copy (nuskha jami'-a) in the meaning that in him there is something of the sky in a certain aspect, and something of the earth in a certain aspect, and something of everything in a certain aspect, but not in all aspects ... It cannot be said that man is the sky, or the earth, or the Throne, but it can be said that he bears a resemblance to the sky in such and such an aspect,' and to the earth-in such and such an aspect, and to the Throne in such and such an aspect, and to the element of fire in such and such an aspect, . . and to everything.

In al-Tadblrat al-Ilahlyya, he explains how to find correspondences in the following way.

When your eyes fall upon a certain existent, search for the attribute which is dominant over that existent . . . You find out that attribute which makes it [i.e., the existent] known and indicates it, be it its essential attribute (al-sifa al-nafslyya) or its dominant attribute. Then you see the very same attribute, and you will most certainly find this attribute in some man, then you apply the name of that which has this attribute to the man, when you observe this attribute.

For example, in point of stupidity which is the dominant attribute of the donkey as compared to other animals, we apply to someone the name of donkey, when we see a stupid man.

In this way, Ibn 'Arabi enumerates the correspondences between various kinds of animals and man who shares their dominant attributes.

Slightly different from the above exposition is the following macrocosm-microcosm theory. Here it is said that the world consists of the mulk and the malakut. The former corresponds to bodily nature (jismanlya) and the latter to spiritual nature. Mountains correspond to the bones; the sea with its tides to the blood running in the body; sweet water to the saliva in the mouth; briny water to tears in the eyes; bitter water to the cerumen in the ear. That part of the body where nothing grows (i.e., hairless parts) corresponds to sterile land. Lakes from which rivers branch out correspond to aortae (watln) which transmit (yabuthth) the blood and from which veins (c urug) extend to the rest of the body. The sun and the moon correspond to the spirit and the intellect, the changes of the moon to those of the intellectual ability according to age. The five revolving planets are the five senses. The Throne corresponds to the heart, the Footstool to the breast (sadr). Paradise and Hell correspond to the heart and the soul respectively, the Well-Preserved Tablet and the Pen to the breast and the tongue. The five senses are the messengers of the heart. However, the above correspondences are not fixed, rather there are many variations even in the same book. For instance, it is often said that the sun corresponds to the spirit, the moon to the soul; or also the Throne corresponds to the imam, which is the spirit; the Footstool to the soul.

After the model of the Secret of Secrets, the main part of Al-Tadbirat al-Ilahlya is occupied by the analogy of the city-state and man. The king, the sovereign of the city, is the spirit, he is the "vicegerent" of God on earth [i.e., the body,] and the imam mubln which is localized in the heart. The model of the state in Ibn 'Arabi is more dynamic and moralistic than that of the Ikhwan al-Safa and Ghazzali. Here the intellect (c agl) which is localized in the brain, is considered the minister (wazlr) as in Ghazzali; however, the soul is the wife of the king. Desire (hawa) is the strong, but evil commander (amir,) who has his own minister named Concupiscence (shahwa.) One day he sees the wife of the king, and falls in

love with her. He employs various wiles to attract her, and finally she is enticed by him. Although the king does not realize what is happening, the wise minister tries to prevent the plan of the commander. One

day, the king calls her, and the call is not answered; he finally asks the minister what has happened. The minister explains the evil plot of the commander, and war breaks out between the army of the king led by the minister and the army of the evil commander.

In Sufism, the soul is often considered feminine, because of its grammatical feminine gender. Ibn 'Arabi quotes the curious idea of Ghazzali that the spirit and the soul marry and the body is born from them. Also in Sufism there are three levels of the soul: the soul commanding evil (nafs ammara bi al-su'i) the upbraiding soul (nafs lawwama,) and the tranquil soul (nafs mutma'inna.) Ibn 'Arabi calls the soul "the place of purification and change" (mahall al-ta'-thlr wa al-taghylr .) It has the potentiality to be purified and also to go wrong, and he quotes the Qur'anic verse, "By the soul, and the proportion and order given to it; He has given it the wickedness and god-fearingness." (/-.) If the soul answers the call of the commander, Desire, she is called "the soul commanding evil;" and if she answers the call of the king, Spirit, she is called "the tranquil soul." Thus he incorporates the Sufi concept of the soul skillfully in this body-state analogy. Also the motif of the war between the good force led by the intellect and the evil force led by the desire is found in Ghazzali. As we have seen before, Ghazzali mainly compares Desire to the tax-collector, and Anger to the police chief. Although they must be controlled by the minister. Intellect, they are useful and necessary officials of the city-body. However, in the *t-Aja'ib al-Qalb* of the *Ihya'* , in addition to the above comparison, he uses the following metaphor in order to explain the relation between the intellect and the desire.

Know that the body is like the city, and the human intellect ... is like the king who governs it; the outer and the inner perceptive faculties are like his soldiers and helpers. The members of the body (a c da') are like his subjects. The "soul commanding evil," which is desire and anger, is like the enemy who fights with him in his kingdom and tries to destroy his subjects.

Then he compares the fight against this enemy to the jihad, and quotes the hadlth, "We returned from the lesser jihad to the greater jihad." In Sufism, it is common to call the fight against one's evil soul the "greater jihad." Although Ibn 'Arabi does not use the concept of the jihad there is no doubt that this common Sufi idea influenced him in his detailed description of the war between the intellect and the desire.

Ibn 'Arabi, like Ghazzall, is not much interested in the anatomical corespondences between the body and the city. Therefore, his analogy is concerned with the moral qualities of man. The leaders (quwwad) of the army of the king are four in number, who defend the four fronts: Fear, Hope, Knowledge (cilm,) and Contemplation (tafakkur.) . However, the stereotyped correspondences are also found in Ibn 'Arabi. The physical organs of the body (such as eyes, ears, tongue hands, belly) are the workers (c ummal) and the trustees (umana') of the treasure (mal .) They are levied by the tax collectors, who are the five outer senses. They carry their taxes to their chief, the common sense. Then the taxes are transmitted successively to the memory (dhikr ,) the thought (fikr,) and the intellect. During the transmission, the taxes change their names from the sensible, to the memorable, then to the thinkable, and finally to the intelligible. Then the intellect brings them to the king, and, finally the king brings them to God (al-Haqq.) What is brought to God is no longer called the intelligibles, but the actions (a'mal.) If God accepts them, they are called "the secrets" (asrar.) Here, although in the beginning he uses philosophical, epistemological terminology, in the end religious terminology gradually intermingles, and finally overpowers it.

Like the Ikhwan, Ibn 'Arabi is ambiguous concerning the five inner senses. In the above account, three of the five senses are mentioned.

In the following passage, the inner senses are localized in the brain.

Then He built a lofty, overlooking, marvelous promenade (mutanazzah) in the highest place of the city, and named it the brain, and opened in it the floors and the apertures for him

[i.e., the king,] from which he overlooks his kingdom; they are the ears, the eyes, the nose, and the mouth. Then He built for him in the front part of this promenade a treasury (khizana,) which He named the treasury of the imagination, and He made it the depository (mustaqarr) of his taxes . . .

Then He built for him in the middle of the promenade the treasury of the thought (fikr,) to which the imaginative (mutakhayyalat) ascend, and He built in the back of this promenade the treasury of the preservation (hafz) , and He made this brain the dwelling place of the minister, who is the intellect .

At the end of al-Tadbirat al—Ilahlya, the detailed correspondences between the four worlds and man are found. According to him, the universe consists of the Higher World, the world of change, the world of habitation of places, and the world of relations, and every world contains a certain number of realities (haqa'iq,) forty-nine altogether. All these realities have their equivalents in man. Therefore there are altogether ninety-eight realities. However, there is in man the divine secret (al-sirr al-ilahi,) which is not found in the universe. Therefore in the entire universe there are ninety-nine realities, which correspond to the ninety-nine names of God. Although he does not explicitly mention it, he said that whoever enumerates them enter Paradise, which is the hadith concerning the enumeration of the Divine Names. Also he adds that there is the hundredth reality which oversees everything, that is the Greatest Name of God.

The Higher World contains twenty Realities: the Univeral Reality of Muhammad and its sphere (falak,) which correspond to the subtle substance (latifa) and the holy spirit (ruh qudsi) in man; the Throne, which corresponds to the body; the Footstool, which corresponds to the soul; the Well-Visited House (The Heavenly Ka c ba,) which corresponds to the heart; the world of angels, which corresponds to spirits (arwah) and ranks (maratib ,)then come the seven heavenly bodies and their spheres, which correspond to faculties of memory, intellection, anger, thinking, estimation, imagination, sense, and their respective locations in the body. The world of change contains fifteen realities: the

spheres of ether, air, water, earth, and their respective spirits, (fire is curiously lacking, perhaps in order to limit the number to eight,) which correspond to the four humors and the powers of rejection, digestion, sucking, holding; and the seven levels of soil, which correspond to the seven levels of the body, i.e., the skin, the fat, the flesh, the blood veins, the nerves, the muscles, and the bones. The world of the habitation of places consist of four realities: the spirituals (rutiar niyw, lower angels?) which correspond to (spiritual) powers; and the three kingdoms, i.e., animals, plants, and minerals, which correspond to the sensible parts, growing parts, and non-growing parts respectively. The world of relations consists of ten realities, which are nine categories of accidents in addition to "movement," all of which are found in man. The divine secret, which is only found in man is the prophetic faculty among prophets and saints. This will be treated in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE PERFECT MAN AS A SUFI SAINT

In the first chapter, we discussed the Perfect Man as man in general, which is symbolized by Adam created in the image of God. However, some

times Ibn 'Arabi contrasts the Perfect Man with the Animal Man. With this contrast he indicates that not all men are the Perfect Man, but only certain special chosen men. In this chapter, first we shall discuss what kind of men are considered specimens of the Perfect Man as compared to the Animal Man, and then we shall analyze the theory of sainthood in Ibn 'Arabi, and finally trace the historical origin of his doctrine.

Ibn 'Arabi

The Perfect Man and The Animal Man

Asin Palacios in his "El místico murciano Abenarabi" collected the

most characteristic passages where the Perfect Man is contrasted with the Animal Man in al-Futuhat al-Makklya. Here all three passages will be analyzed. The first passage appears in the long one hundred ninety-ninth chapter entitled "On the Knowledge of the Breath of the Merciful and Its Secrets."

When God wanted the perfection of the human constitution (al-nash' a al-insanlya,) He combined (jama'-a) for it with His two hands all the realities of the universe, and gave them to it, and He manifested Himself to it in all His Names. Thus, man attained both the divine image (al-sura al-ilahiya) and the creaturely image (al-sura al-kawniya.) He made all the species (asnaf) of the universe vis-a-vis man similar to the member of the body vis-a-vis the spirit which governs them. If this man leaves the universe, the universe dies . . . Now, since man possesses this Divine Name "The Combiner" (al-Jami*-,) he thereby corresponds these two presences (al-hadratayn, i.e., divine and creaturely) by his very essence. Therefore, he became the true vicegerent and manager of the universe and its details. If a man does not reach the rank of perfection, then, he is an animal whose outer shape resembles the shape of man. Here we are concerned with the Perfect Man. At first, God did not create of this species except the perfect one — he is Adam. Thus God demonstrated the rank of perfection for this species. Whoever attains this rank is Man who we are referring to, and he who goes down from this stage possesses humanity in proportion to where he is.

In the above passage, it is stated that it is only those that have attained the rank of perfection who can be called man in the true sense of the word, that is, the Perfect Man. Whoever does not reach the rank of perfection is an animal who only resembles man in outer shape. Through the first man, Adam, God showed the model of perfection, and the synthetic nature of man can only be applied to the Perfect Man,

The second and third passages of Asin Palacios are both taken from the three hundred sixty-fifth chapter entitled "On the Knowledge of the

Station (manzil) of the Collaboration (ishtirak) with God in Determination (taqdlr.)"

When God had created the universe with the exception of man, i.e., without his synthetic nature (majmii*-,) He modeled his form (sura) upon the form of the entire universe. Hence, there is no part of the universe which is not in the image of man. I mean by the universe everything except God. Then He separated man from the universe after He regulated (dabbara) it. Thus, man is identical with the regulating command'Of God.] Then God modeled him spiritually (khadwan ma c nawlyan) on the Presence (hadra) of the Divine Names. They [i.e., the Divine Names] appeared in man as images appear in the mirror to the viewer. Then, he separated him from the Presence of the Divine Names after their powers (quwa) have been produced in it. He manifested Himself through them in his spirit and in his interior. Therefore, the outer aspect of man is the creature (khalq) and his inner aspect is God (haqq.)

This is, then, the Perfect Man, the sought-for object (matlub) [of the creation.] Whatever is besides him [i.e.. the Perfect Man] is the Animal Man. The rank of the Animal Man in relation to the Perfect Man is the rank of the nisrias [half-human monster] in relation to the Animal Man.

Then Ibn 'Arabi proceeds in detail to describe the formation of the universe in terms of the four elements. After explaining as far as the emergence of the plant and the animal, he concludes as follows:

When the bodily formation (al-nash'a al-jismianlya) of the plant and the animal was completed, there appeared in it all the faculties (quwa) of the animal. He gave it [i.e., the animal] [the faculty of] cognition from the faculty of the practical soul (al-nafs al-'amallya) . . . For the animal, everything it knows about the crafts is not through [deliberate] regulation (tadbir) nor through vision (ru'ya,) rather its knowledge is intuitive, and it does not know from

where this perfection (itqan) and firmness (ihkam) come to it; thus are spiders, bees, and hornets. Man, on the other hand, knows that he cannot discover anything except through thought, vision, and [deliberate] regulation. Therefore man knows from where this comes. The rest of animals know the thing, but do not know its source. It is this which distinguishes man from other animals and nothing else. This is a condition (hala) which is common to all men except the Perfect Man, for the Perfect Man adds to the Animal Man in the life of this world through the manipulation (tasrif) of Divine Names, whose powers he had taken into himself, when God had created a correspondence between him and them, after having created his correspondence with the universe. Thus God made the Perfect Man a vicegerent on behalf of the Great Universal Man (al-insan al-kull al-kabir,) who is the shadow of God on His creation from His creation. It is because of this that he [the Perfect Man] is a vicegerent. And for this reason, they [i.e., men] are vicegerents on behalf of one single vicegerent. They are, therefore, shadows of divine lights, which correspond to the primordial man (al-insan al-z asli.)

These are the lights of Divine manifestations, which come in succession upon him from all sides. Therefore, there appear for him numerous shadows in accordance with the number of Divine manifestations, for every divine manifestation has light which yields a shadow of the form of man in the material existence (wujud c unsuri.) That shadow, then, becomes a vicegerent, and from it come particular, individual vicegerents. As for the Animal Man, this is not at all his origin, rather his nature is just like the natures of other animals, except that he is distinguished from each other by the differentia which constitutes his nature, just as animals are distinguished from each other through the differentiae which constitute each one of them [i.e., animal species,] because the horse is not the donkey insofar as his constitutive differentia is concerned, nor is the mule, nor the bird, nor the beast of prey, nor the worm. The Animal Man is, therefore, from

among the totality of creeping animals (jumlat al-hasharat.)

When he becomes perfect, he is a vicegerent.

This contrast between the Perfect Man and the Animal Man is not limited to al-Futuhat al-Makklya, but is also found in Ibn 'ArabI's other writings. For instance, in the c Uqlat al-Mustawfiz, it is said:

Since the Perfect Man is in the perfect image, the vicegerency and deputyship (niy'aba) of God on earth is fitting to him.

Let us explain in this station the formation (nash'a) of this vicegerent and his station and his real image. We do not mean by man the Animal Man, rather man who is the vicegerent. On account of his humanity and vicegerency, man deserves the image in perfection. Every man is not a vicegerent. In our opinion, the Animal Man is not a vicegerent.

The same contrast appears also in the Fusus al-Hikam.

God subjected (sakhkhara) to him [Adam, i.e., the Perfect Man] the higher world and the lower world because of the perfection of his image. Just as there is nothing in the universe which does not praise God (c.f. Qur'an /,) so is there nothing in the universe which is not subjected to him because of that [perfection] which the reality of his image gives him. God said, "He has subjected to you, as a charge from Him, all that is in the heavens and the earth." [/.] Therefore everything in the universe is kept in subjugation (taskhrl) to man. Whoever knows this knows this, and he is the Perfect Man. Whoever does not know this does not know this, and he is the Animal Man.

From the above passages, we can conclude the following points:

. Among men only those who have attained the rank of perfection can be called the Perfect Man.

. The rest belong to the Animal Man, who is different from other animals only through his differentia which constitutes his nature, just as the horse is different from other animals through its differentia.

. The difference between the Animal Man and the Perfect Man lies in the latter's ability to manipulate (tasrif) the Divine Names.

In the first chapter it is said that man is created according to the Divine Names and also according to the universe. Thus man has this double nature. His inside aspect is God, his outside aspect the creature. However, if one has only the outside aspect, that is, if he is not the synthesis of the Divine Names, he is not man in the real sense of the word, because he lacks this double nature. He is the Animal Man, who is not superior to other animals.

However, the difference between the Perfect Man and the Animal Man is not absolute, because man is in reality created for perfection. Therefore every man has the possibility to attain the rank of perfection.

As long as man lives, he has a hope of attaining the attribute of "perfection" for which he was created. Whoever tried to destroy him tried to prevent him from arriving at that [perfection] for which he was created.

Although man is not in actuality the Perfect Man, he has always the possibility to attain the rank of perfection for which he was created. In the next section, we propose to investigate how man can attain this perfection.

The Heart of the Gnostic

In the following passage of the Fusus al-Hikam, the Perfect Man is explicitly equated with the Sufi gnostic ('arif.)

Since the manifestation of God takes various shapes, the heart

must also widen or narrow in accordance with the shapes of His manifestation. The heart cannot exceed the shapes of his manifestation, for the heart of a gnostic C'-arif,) that is, the Perfect Man, corresponds to the station (manzila) of the setting (mahall) of the jewel (fass) on the ring; the setting does not exceed the size of the jewel, rather it follows the size and the shape of the jewel. If the jewel is round, the setting is round; if it is square, or hexagonal, or octagonal, the setting is also square, or hexagonal, or octagonal.

Here, the heart of the gnostic is compared to the setting of the jewel, and the jewel to the manifestation of God in various shapes. Then how should we understand this divine manifestation?

In al-Futuhat al Makklya, the Perfect Man is said to be the heart in relation to the body of the universe.

Through the Perfect Man appeared the perfection of the image (kamal al-sura.) He is the heart to the body of the universe. The universe is the expression for everything other than God. It [the heart] is the Well-Visited House (al-bayt al~ma : mur) of God, since it contains Him. He says in a hadlth, "Neither my earth nor my heaven contains Me, but the heart of my pious slave contains Me." The rank of the Perfect Man in respect of his being the heart lies between God and the universe. He named it the heart (qalb) because of its altering (taqlib) in every shape. "Every day He is [employing Himself] in an affair" [/] and in his changing (tasrif) and his capability of changing. Because of this, he has this divine breadth (sl c a ilahiya.)

Ibn 'Arabi connects the word "heart" with the concept of altering (taqlib) and sometimes with "transformation (taqallub.) The Perfect Man, the Sufi gnostic, constantly changes the shape of his heart in accordance with the changing shapes of God's self-manifestation. Only through this constant changing can he receive the totality of the Divine self-manifestations.

For the gnostic (c arlf) God is the one known who is never denied . . . For this reason, He says "for those who have the heart (qalb)" [,,] i.e., those who know the shapes of the transformation (taqallub) of God by changing (taqllb) his heart into [many] shapes.

Ibn 'Arabi repeatedly emphasizes that God changes constantly His shapes in which He manifests Himself, and he quotes the hadith, "God changes His forms in his Self-manifestation . , He expresses succinctly that the Self-manifestation of God never repeats itself, and the Perfect Man is the locus of His self-manifestation.

There is no one among existents (mawjudat) who can contain God except [the Perfect Man.] He does not contain Him except through receiving [His] image. He [the Perfect Man] is the locus of God's self-manifestation.

However, there is the commonly held view that God manifests Himself in accordance with the predisposition (isti c dad) of man:

I [God] will present things (al-umur) to you [Ezra] by means of manifestations (z ala tajalll.) Manifestation will happen only in accordance with your predisposition (isti'dad,) through which intuitive perception (al-idrak al-dhawqiya) comes to you. Know that you will not perceive except in accordance with your predisposition.

Ibn 'Arabi tries to reconcile this commonly-held view with his opinion that man receives the manifestation of God by transforming his heart in accordance with the shapes of His manifestation. For this purpose, he introduces a distinction between the two types of manifestation; invisible (tajalll al-ghayb) and visible (al-tajalll al-shuhitdl,)

Through the first manifestation the initial predisposition is given to the heart. This constitutes the manifestation of the Divine Identity (hitwlya.) * Thereafter God manifests Himself in various visible shapes.

The first manifestation Li.e., that of the Divine Identity] should be interpreted through Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of the "unity of existence" (wahdat al-wujūd.) This is the manifestation of God's absolute existence, and does not contain any multiplicity and differentiation. The existence of God is immanent in all existents equally. In this respect, man is not superior to any other existent in the universe.

The second manifestation is that of the Divine Names. In this manifestation, God manifests Himself in various shapes of the universe according to the latent predisposition of each existent. In other words, the Divine Names manifest themselves as the realities of the existents in the universe. In the case of man, God manifests Himself in his heart as the God-created-in-his-belief (al-Haqqa al-makhluq fi al-īzati qad.) It means that man knows and sees God in one of the Divine Names peculiar to him. This God is in reality his own self reflected in the mirror of Divinity. However, if one believes only in the God-created-in-his-belief, he cannot be said to be the synthesis of all the Divine Names, because he restricts the infinite possibilities of the manifestation of God to one particular shape, and denies His manifestation in other shapes.

He who restricts God [to the God-created-in-his-belief] denies Him in other beliefs, affirming Him only when He is manifest in his own belief. He who does not restrict Him thus does not deny Him, but affirms God in every shape of His manifestation, worshipping Him in His infinite shapes, since there is no limit to the shapes in which He manifests Himself.

God is manifest in every created being and in every concept. The gnostic is the one who sees God in everything, and worships Him in the infinite shapes of His manifestation.

Ibn 'Arabi contrasts the heart with the intellect ('aql) as an instrument to know God. The latter restricts and tries to define God within the framework of the God-created-in belief. It is the instrument used by theologians and philosophers. But the heart of the gnostic

accepts every shape of God's manifestation by changing its own shape.

In this way the totality of the Divine Names are manifested in him. As we have seen in the first chapter, this totality, that is, the synthesis which Adam, the Perfect Man possesses, characterizes human existence, and gives man the rank of the vicegerent of God on earth. On the other hand, those who limit God's manifestation to one particular shape, that is, to one particular Divine Name, cannot be said to realize this synthesis. In this respect, they are not different from animals. Only a Sufi gnostic, who sees the manifestation of the Divine Names in every existent of the universe, can be called the Perfect Man.

In the next section, we deal with Ibn 'Arabi's theory of sainthood, and its difference from prophethood.

Sainthood and Prophethood

In the hundred sixty-seventh chapter of the *Futuhat*, Ibn 'Arabi expresses the rank of Perfection as vicegerency conferred on Adam:

Know that as for the desired perfection (al-kamal al-matlub) for which man is created — that is, vicegerency —

Adam attained it through divine providence (c inaya ilahfya.)

This (i.e., vicegerency) is more particular (akhass) than messengership (risala) of messengers, because not every messenger is vicegerent. The rank of messengership lies especially in transmission (tabllgh) ... He (i.e., the messenger) does not have (his own) domination (tahakkum, i.e., autarchic action); he has only legislation (tashrl c) of ordinance (hukm) from God ... If God gives him dominion over those to whom he was sent, then this is [the case of] the appointment of a vicegerent (istikhlas) and vicegerency [i.e., in this case he is both the messenger and the vicegerent.] Not every one who is sent [as messenger] has dominion.

When he is given the sword and carries out actions, at that time he possesses perfection and manifests the sovereignty (sultan) of the Divine Names . . . When he shows dominance without prophethood (nubuwa,) then he is a king (malik,) not a vicegerent. No one is vicegerent [in the real sense of the word] except those whom God appointed vicegerent over His slaves. Those who are elected by people, acknowledged by them, and appointed by themselves over themselves are not vicegerents. This [the true vicegerency] is the rank of perfection. It is permitted for souls to make efforts to obtain the station (maqam) of perfection. But it is not [allowed] for them to make efforts to obtain prophethood. Vicegerency may be obtainable (muktasaba,) but prophethood is not obtainable.

In the above passage, three important concepts, "vicegerency," "messengership," and "prophethood" are used. The first term "vicegerency" is the rank of perfection, and the vicegerent corresponds to the Perfect Man symbolized by Adam. In the c Uqlat al~Mustawfiz it is said:

God made them vicegerents (khala'if) after there had been a vicegerent [i.e., Adam.] Every perfect one (kamil) is a vicegerent. There is no period which lacks a perfect one.

There is no lack of a vicegerent and an Imam. The earth is never devoid of manifestation (zuhur) of the Divine image.

Although it is said that vicegerency is more special than messengership and that all messengers are not vicegerents, still not all vicegerents are messengers either. If this were the case, there would be no vicegerents after Muhammad. Ibn 'ArabI must mean that vicegerents are more chosen and higher than messengers: the latters only transmit messages, while the formers have the power to judge and rule. However, those who have only dominion and do not have prophethood are not vicegerents, but secular kings. Therefore, the real vicegerent, the Perfect Man, must have both dominion and prophethood. However, it is also clearly stated that prophethood is unobtainable. How can one obtain

the rank of perfection, that is vicegerency, without obtaining prophethood? This difficulty can be only solved when we distinguish two types of prophethood, that is, the prophethood which is obtainable after Muhammad, and the prophethood which is impossible to obtain after Muhammad.

Ibn 'ArabI does, in fact, distinguish two types of prophethood: general prophethood (al-nubuwa al-'-amma) and the prophethood of legislation (nubuwa al-tashri').) The former is also called absolute prophethood (al-nubuwa al-mutlaqa) and the prophethood of [divine] instruction (nubuwa al-ta'rif.) The latter is identical with messengership (risala.)

Messengership is not general, but particular in two points. First, the law (shar c) which a messenger brings is intended for the whole community, therefore it is limited by the community's ability to understand it and also by their need.

Know that messengers, as [the qualification of] messengers, not [as the qualification of] saints (awliya') and gnostics (t arifun) are in accordance with the levels (maratib) on which their communities (umam) are; the knowledge (c ilm) with which they are sent is in accordance with the need of their respective communities; no more and no less. Some communities are superior to others. Therefore, some messengers are superior to others in knowledge of transmission (irsal) in accordance with the degree of superiority of their communities .

Then he quotes the Qur'anic passage, "Those messengers to some of whom we gave preference over others." (..)

Secondly, the knowledge which messengers bring only concerns the permitted and the prohibited. They are only applicable to this world (al-dunyb), however, they lose their applicability in the next world. The prophethood of legislation came to an end with Muhammad, and after him no one can add to nor cancel the laws which he brought. What is left after him is the general prophethood without legislation. It is this

general prophethood which is called "sainthood" (walaya.)

Know that sainthood (walaya) is the general C z amm,J comprehensive (muhlt) sphere. Therefore it was not cut off. It [sainthood] has [the function of] general transmission (inba' c amm.) As for the prophethood of legislation and messengership, they are ended. It is ended with Muhammad. There is no prophet after him . . . However, God is kind to His servants, and left the general prophethood which does not have the [function of] legislation.

The general prophethood has the function of receiving the divine knowledge directly from God, as its other name "prophethood of divine instruction" indicates.

It is possible that this saint is given the. knowledge of [divine] secrets which was given to the prophets, because this does not belong to the characteristics of prophethood. The lawgiver (shari c) does not interdict this gate to his community. Rather, he [Muhammad] said, "if there are in my community those who are spoken to by God (muhaddathun,) then c Umar is among them." Thus, the Prophet affirmed that there are those who are spoken to by God among those who are not prophets. What is spoken by God to such a man is outside the legislation (tashriO of legal judgments (ahkam) concerning the allowed (halal) and the prohibited (haram,) because this [i.e., legislation] is among the characteristics (khasa'is) of prophethood of legislation (nubiiwa al-tasbr rl c .) Rather, it permeates (saryan) [all] the slaves of God, both in messengers and saints, in the followers and the followed.

The knowledge given by God without any intermediary to saints is different from the knowledge given to messengers with the intermediation of angels. Ibn 'Arabi often uses the story of Khadir and Moses in the Qur'an as an example. Khadir, the saint, is given by God the most

secret knowledge ladunn1,) which is beyond the understanding of

Moses, the messenger. However, from this, Ibn 'ArabI does not draw the conclusion that saints are, therefore, superior to messengers, because messengers receive not only the sacred laws through the angels, but also divine knowledge which does not concern the sacred laws, directly from God.

The messenger does not take this judgement (hukm) except through descent of the ruh al-amln [i.e., the Angel Gabriel] on his heart or through an image (mittial) in his witnessing, in which the angel takes on the likeness of man . . . When prophethood and also messengership had been declared impossible after the Messenger of God, this person [i.e., the saint] has [divine] instruction (ta c rlf) about the Muhammadan Law over him in the sensible world. If there is [a saint] in the period of legislation, just as there is [Khadir], in the period of Moses, the divine judgement would appear to this saint as it appeared to Khadir, without intermediacy of an angel, rather from the presence of proximity (hadra al-qurb.) Both prophets and messengers have [also] the presence of proximity just as saints have. However, they [i.e., messengers] do not have legislation from the presence of proximity, they only have legislation through the angel.

In other words, prophets and messengers are all saints and receive both the sacred law and divine gnosis. The concept of sainthood contains in it prophethood of legislation, i.e., messengership, which is why sainthood is said to be more general and comprehensive.

Know that sainthood is comprehensive (muhlta) and general (c amma.) It is a great circle (da'ira.) Within its characteristic (hukm) is that God entrusts whomsoever of slaves He wishes with prophethood. This is one of the characteristics (ahkam) of sainthood. He may entrust him with messengership. This is also one of the characteristics of sainthood.

Every messenger must be a prophet, and every prophet must be a saint. Therefore, every messenger must be a saint. Messengership is a particular station in sainthood . . . The reality (hagiga) of messengership is the transmission (iblagh) of words from a speaker to a listener; therefore this is a [transitory] condition (hal,) not a [permanent] station (magam.) It does not have permanence (bags') after the transmission is executed, although it can be renewed (tatajaddad J

Therefore, if some Sufis say that saints are superior to messengers, it must be understood that within one and the same person, the function of sainthood is higher than that of messengership, because they are not referring to two different persons.

If you see the prophet speak about matters outside legislation, he is speaking as (min hayth) a saint and a gnostic (t-arif.) Therefore, his station as a knower (: alim) is more complete (atamm) and more perfect than his station as a messenger and a possessor of legislation and the sacred law-. If you hear one of the people of God (ahl Allah) say, or it is reported to you that he said that the saint is above the prophet and the messenger, he who says this only wants to express what I mentioned above, namely he means with this [what is] in one person: he means that the Prophet as a saint (min hayth hiiwa wall) is more complete than as a prophet and a messenger.

However, there still remains the question of superiority between the Prophet and saints. Ibn 'Arabi continues the above quotation as follows :

It is not that the saint who follows him [Muhammad] is higher than him. Indeed, the follower (tabi O can never reach the one who is followed (matbu c) insofar as he is a follower of him .

The saints who follow the sacred law brought by Muhamad can never reach the rank of Muhammad. Obviously the saint who has also the function of legislation is higher than those without it. However, according to Ibn 'Arabi, the saints follow the sacred law brought by Muhammad only in the outer sense. In the inner sense, they receive the same knowledge as the Prophet from the same source, i.e., from God. In this sense, they are equal in rank.

God has on earth His vicegerents (khalaif) ; they are the messengers. As for the vicegerency of the present day, they are [vicegerents] of the prophets, but not of God. They do not govern (yahkumiina) except through the laws which the Messenger gave them; they do not go outside this law. However, here is a subtle point (daqlqa) which only people like us know.

This [subtle point] concerns [the manner of] receiving the law brought by Muhammad through which they govern. The vicegerents of the prophet are those who take the authority (hukm) through transmission from him [i.e., Muhammad] or through ijtiyah, whose basis is also transmitted from him. However, among us, there are those who receive it from God. Then he [such a man] is a vicegerent of God through this selfsame authority. The source (madda) [of his authority] is the same source from which the Prophet took his authority. Such a man outwardly (fi al-zahir) follows [the Prophet,] because he has no contradiction in his judgment (hukm) [against the sacred Law] . . . he is with regard to what he knows concerning the manner (sura) of reception is special (mukhtass) (mukhtass) and in complete agreement [with the prophets]

... Thus [the manner in which] the vicegerent receives from God is the same as that of the messenger. We say of him [such a man] in the esoteric expression (bi lisan al—kashf) "the vicegerent of God" and in the esoteric expression (bi lisan al-zahir) "the vicegerent of the messenger of God."

Although Ibn 'Arabi is very cautious about the problem of superiority

between saints and prophets, it can be seen in the above passage that he is very clear about saints' superiority to those religious scholars who receive the judgements only through the transmission from Muhammad.

Of course, Ibn 'Arabi does not deny the value of religious scholars, because they also preserve the knowledge of the prophets through the intermediary of transmitters. They are the preservers of the legal judgements of Muhammad (hafiza al-hukm al-nabawl,) while saints are the preservers of the prophetic condition (hafiza al-tial al-nabawl) and the secret knowledge (c ilm ladunni.)

In the hadlth it is said that the knowers (c ulama') of this community are the prophets of Israelites. They [i.e., the prophets] preserved for them [i.e., Israelites] the sacred laws (shara'i c) of their messengers and carried them out among them. The same is true of the knowers of the companions (satiaba) [of the Prophet,] of the followers, and of the followers of the followers . . . But the other group of knowers of this community preserve for the community conditions (ahwal) of the Messenger and the secrets of his knowledge (c ulum.) The secrets of the preservers of the judgement (hukm) [of the Prophet] stop (mawqufa) at the Footstool (kursi) of the two Feet (qadamayn,) since they do not have a prophetic condition which gives them a divine secret, nor do they have the mystic knowledge (c ilm ladunni.) The secrets of the preservers of the prophetic condition and the mystic knowledge as compared to knowers and preservers of the prophetic judgement only stop at the Throne and the Dark Cloud (c amar) or they do not stop at all.

Although both religious scholars and saints are preservers of the prophetic knowledge, the knowledge of the saints is higher and more certain than that of the religious scholars. Ibn 'Arabi emphasizes the superiority of the saints' knowledge on two points; the problem of the authenticity of the hadlth and the application of anthropomorphic expressions to God. The hadlth scholars judge the authenticity of a hadlth on the basis of the continuity of isnad and the reliability of

the transmitters. This is a mechanical procedure and there is no inner religious consideration for its content. However, Ibn 'Arabi gives priority to direct divine instruction for determining the authenticity of hadlth. Even if all the hadlth scholars declare a hadlth to be true, it is false when God instructs a saint that it is false. The judgement of hadlth scholars is ultimately human judgement, and fallible, while the judgement of saints is divine judgement, and infallible."

Secondly, Ibn 'Arabi defends the saints' use of such anthropomorphic expressions as "laughter," "surprise," "smile," "anger," "hesitation," "hatred," "love," and "desire" in regard to God. Because these expressions appear in hadlths, and also these expressions come to the saint directly from God in the same manner as they come to the prophet, it is unjust to blame the saint and believe in the words of the prophet . This apologia is obviously addressed to theologians who tried to avoid any. trace .of anthropomorphism concerning God. And Ibn 'Arabi expresses his anger toward these religious scholars hostile to Sufism.

Where is your justice (insaf)? Does justice exist among jurists, rational thinkers (ashab al~afkar) who are the pharaohs to the saints and Anti-Christ to the pious slaves of God ?

Also in al-Futuhat al-Makklya, there are numerous places where Ibn 'Arabi criticizes the intolerance of conventional religious scholars (c ulama r al~rusum.) He especially attacks the jurists, who flatter the rulers by employing various legal tricks .

Ibn 'Arabi emphasizes again and again that the knowledge of the saints is based on direct personal experiences, therefore, it is infallible. For instance, in al-Tadbirat al-Ilahlya, it is explained in the following manner.

If someone scares you away from the Way, saying to you, "Ask the people of the Way to show the proof (dallD and demonstration Cburhan) for the divine secrets (asrar ilahiya) which they speak about," then ask him back, saying "What is

the proof for the sweetness of honey? What is the proof for the pleasure of sexual intercourse and its like? Inform me about the essence of this thing." Then he can only say that this is a kind of knowledge which can be obtained only through direct experience (dhawq,) it does not fall under any definition, and it cannot be proven. Then say to him, "This is like that."

Ibn 'Arabi proceeds to give the following parable for the infallibility of the knowledge of the saints: A certain person built a house by himself, and did not allow anyone to see its inside, but rumor about the house was spread abroad, and people learned about it. The owner of the house chose one of his friends, took him inside, and showed it to him. When the chosen one left the house, he told the people what he saw inside it. In this case, it is absurd to ask him for the proof and demonstration for his story. One should simply believe what one has been told and wish that some day, he also would have the opportunity to enter the house and see its inside with his own eyes. And Ibn 'Arabi concludes that the secret knowledge (*- ilm ladunril) which God conferred upon Khadir, and also upon the saints is of this kind, and those who cannot have direct experience of it can do nothing but believe.

Like Tirmidhi, Ibn 'Arabi classifies the saints according to a hierarchical order. His classification is much more complicated and extensive. First, he distinguishes the classes of the saints into those whose number is fixed at any given time and those whose number varies according to the ages. A The number of saints who belong to the first 'category is five hundred and eighty-nine, and there are thirty-five classes, beginning from the one qutb, followed by the two imams, the four awtad (pegs,) and the seven abdal (substitutes) and so on. Here, however, we would like to examine two classes of the saints which belong to the second category, namely the muqarrabun and the afrad, because they seem to realize Ibn 'Arabi's idea of sainthood best.

The muqarrabun are placed between the prophets who bring the Law and the siddiqun who believe in the words of the prophet and attain the knowledge of tawhid which the prophet brought. They believe only

through the light of faith (niir al-iman) without receiving any direct revelation from God. On the other hand, the muqarrabun acquire the knowledge of tawhid directly from God, guided by the light of knowledge (niir al-'ilm,) just like the prophets. In other words, their knowledge of God does not depend on the teachings of the prophets.

Then, he affirms that knowledge is higher than faith, quoting the Qur'anic verse, "God witnesses that there is no God but He, and so do the angels and those possessed of knowledge" (.) The siddiqun who transmit the words of God carefully and believe in them and thereby attain the knowledge of God through faith correspond to the religious scholars (especially hadlth scholars) who are called preservers of the prophetic judgement in the previous section. On the other hand, the muqarrabun correspond to the saints in general. In fact, Ibn 'Arabi calls the station "the station of absolute prophethood" (maqam al-nu~buwa al-mutlaqa / or "the station of general prophethood" (maqam al-nubuwa al- c amma.)

The afrad seems to be another name for the muqarrabun, because it is said that the afrad possess "the station of proximity" (maqam al-qurba) which is placed between legislative prophethood (nubuwat al-tashriO and the siddiqiya . What then does Ibn 'Arabi mean by the term afrad? The term afrad is defined as those who are outside the hierarchy governed by the qutb . The qutb does not have any control over them. They receive the inner knowledge (al-'ilm al-batm) from the Presence of proximity (hadrat al-qurba ,/ Ibn 'ArabI writes as follows concerning Muhammad Ibn Qa'id, one of the companions of c Abd al-Qadir al-Jill.

It is said that Ibn Qa'id saw only the step (qadam) of the Prophet in front of him. Therefore he must belong to the class of the afrad. If he were not a fard, but an Imam, he would have seen the step of the qutb of his time in addition to the step of the Prophet. If he were a watad, he would have seen three steps. If he were a badal, he would have seen four steps.

Khadir is one of the afrad , and so was C Al Ibn Abl Talib. Muhammad was also a fard before he became prophet. It is interesting to note that the qutb himself is a fard. * And Ibn 'ArabI mentions the names of many Sufis who belong to the class of the afrad .

Among the classes of the saints in the first category, there are those who follow the "heart" of various angels and prophets. However,

it is only the afrbd who follow "the heart" of Muhammad. "To follow the heart of Muhammad" means to receive the same manifestations of God as Muhammad received through the same transformation of the heart as that of Muhammad. Therefore, they are prophets, although they do not bring new Laws. Ibn 'ArabI properly calls them the prophet-saints (al-anbiya' al-awliya').) It is the afrad who are the real heirs of Muhammad.

In the next section, first we shall examine the theory of sainthood in Hakim TirmidhI and then, by comparing it to Ibn 'Arabi's early theory of sainthood, we hope to elucidate the development of Ibn 'ArabI's theory and its originality.

Hakim Tirmidhi

It is well-known that Hakim TirmidhI is the first who elaborated the theory of sainthood. Although the concept of sainthood appears much earlier than him in numerous hadlths, it is he who made the concept of saints the cornerstone of all his writings, and all later Sufis based their theory of sainthood on TirmidhI. Ibn 'ArabI's theory of sainthood is no exception. TirmidhI's theory of sainthood has attracted the attention of many scholars, especially since the publication of his most important book, *Khatm al-Awliya'* by Osman Yahya. His theory of sainthood is complex and lengthy; here we have to limit our discussion to the aspect of his doctrine which seems to have influenced Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of sainthood.

The Hierarchy of Saints

Tirmidhi classifies saints into two categories according to the manner they proceed, based on the Qur'anic verse, "God chooses unto himself those whom He wills, and guides to Himself those who turn to Him repently." C / .] The first category, which is called "the people of divine guidance and turning (to God)" (ahl al-hidayah wa al-inaba,) include those who exert tremendous efforts to proceed on their way to God, undergoing many trials and battles against their own soul (nafs.) The second category, which is called "the people of divine choice and will" (ahl al-jibaya wa al-mashl'a) or "the chosen ones" (mujtabun) or "those drawn (by God to God)" (majdhubun,) is those who are chosen by God from the beginning, and protected by God against all errors and temptations all through their way to God through divine providence (c inaya ilahiya.)

Besides the above classification, Tirmidhi also classifies saints according to their levels, although this classification is not always clear because of his loose and ambiguous use of terms. The lowest level is called sadiqun and sometimes also awliya' haqq Allah ("the saints of duty toward God" in Geyoushi's translation, gottesfreund, der unter der aufsicht des sollens steht" in Radtke's translation.) They approach God through their own sidq (sincerity) with severe struggles with their own souls, always acting under the permission of God. The description of their state corresponds to the first category of the previous classification. Their place (mahall) is in the lower heaven (sama' dunya) which is called symbolically "The House of Power" (Bayt al-'izza.) Their long and difficult fight against their souls is a favorite subject of Tirmidhi, and is treated in detail in his various writings. When they find themselves in utter distress in their inhuman efforts in battles against the soul, they finally turn to God desperately for help, then God answers their cry, and raises them to the higher place. Here, Tirmidhi quotes the Qur'anic verse, "Or, who answers the distressed one when he calls upon Him and removes the evil, and makes you vicegerents in the earth." (.) Thus they become the awliya' Allah from the awliya' haqq Allah.

This second rank is called al-ahrar al-kiram (the free and noble.) Their place is that of proximity (mahall al-qurba,) which is

symbolically called "the well-visited House" (al-Bayt al~ma c miir.) This rank is shared by both categories of the first classification. However, for the people of the first category, the place of proximity is not a secure position; once they arrive at this position, they may be overtaken by vanity and pride, and their old enemy, the soul, can again find its way to their heart. Then, they will fall down to the previous position. On the other hand, those who are chosen by God and drawn to Him step by step through divine providence are immune from these dangers without any conscious efforts.

The third rank is called siddlqun. They are the saints (awliya' Allah) par excellence. It is the highest rank the people of divine guidance can achieve. The siddlqun attain the majalis al~najwa (sittings with God in intimacy.) They possess firasa (intuitive knowledge,) iltiam (inspiration,) and above all, siddlqiya (veridical vision.) Their place is in mulk al~mulk (the kingdom of the kingdom,) which is the highest of the ten kingdoms which they must pass in order to acquire the ten qualities (khisal) of sainthood. These kingdoms are: jabarut, sultan, jalal, jamial, c azama, hayba, rahrna, baba', bahja, and fardanlya or wahdanlya, which is also called mulk al-mulk, and they, as a whole, make up the supreme kingdom of Divine Attributes. The saints are transported from one kingdom to another, acquiring in each kingdom its corresponding divine quality. Each kingdom consists of states (maqamat,) and each quality is subdivided, thus, there are as many divine qualities as the Names of God, that is, there are altogether one hundred divine qualities. In other words, saints must assimilate the Divine Attributes which the Divine Names represent, and acquire the Godly characters.

The highest rank is muhaddathUn , This is the rank promised only to the second category of saints. They are all called munfaridiin , and their rank, the rank of infirad. iti They are the leaders of the saints (sadat al-awliya') iS and even placed between the saints and the prophets. In addition to firasa, ilham, and siddiqlya, they possess hadlth, by which they are distinguished from other saints. As a link between the saints and the prophets they have close similarities to the prophets, and their hadlth to revelation (wahy.) Indeed,

Tirmidhi very often compares the prophets with the saints, especially with the muhaddathun. In the next section, we will see how Tirmidhi explains the similarities and differences among messengers, prophets and saints.

Messengers, Prophets and Saints

Tirmidhi places prophets and messengers next to the muhaddathun in the ascending order of the saints which we have analyzed in the previous section. This is most clearly described in the following passage of his work, the *Ma'rifat al-Asrar*.

Intellect is noble; faith is nobler; siddiqiya is nobler than faith, because one cannot be a siddiq except with intellect and faith. Siddiqiya is the beginning of prophethood, while the siddiqiya of prophethood is different from the siddiqiya of the community (umma,) just as God said,

"Mention in the Book Abraham. Indeed, he was a siddiq, and a prophet." (.) Thus also Idris was a siddiq that is, he was a siddiq when he was young, and became a prophet when he grew up. Hadlth is nobler than siddiqiya. Hadlth is the middle of prophethood and the end of hadlth is prophethood . . . Prophethood is the completion of the rank (tamam al-daraja.) Messengership is nobler than prophethood. Vicegerency (khilafa) in messengership is nobler than messengership without vicegerency. Speech (kalam) in messengership is nobler than vicegerency in messengership. Intimacy (khulla) in messengership is nobler than speech in messengership.

Hadlth in messengership is nobler than intimacy in messengership. Increase (mazld) from God never ceases, because He does not have any limit. Prophethood is a complete condition (hala tamma.) What is added to it is an addition to excess Cfadl,) not an addition to deficiency (nuqsan.) as

The manner in which muhaddathun are chosen by God from the beginning is the same as that for prophets. And they call people to God with clear proof together with the Prophet.

Concerning the calling to God, [it is! promulgation (nashr) for grace, the sending (ba'-th) from the benevolence (minan,) recollection (dhikr) of His blessings (ala',) and declaration of the absolute transcendence of God in His unity. This calling belongs only to the followers of Muhammad. His followers are those who proceed to God on their way. However, the way (tariqa) of saints is not the way of prophets, since prophets are the people whom God chooses with His will, while saints are the people who God guides through their turning to Him repently. This was made clear in the sending down (tanzll) of His words, "God chooses to Himself those whom He wills, and guides to Himself those who turn to Him repently." [/.] God draws to Himself the heart of whoever He chooses, then leads it to Him in the way of those whom He draws to Himself. As for those who turn repently to God, the way of "turning (inaba) to God" opens to them, and He guides them. The way of prophets is a shortened way, while the way of saints is the way of the main street (jadda,) which He prescribed for His servants, based on sincerity (sidq,) faithfulness (wafa') and through purification of the heart and the cleansing of their character, so that they may reach Him. Prophets are led [to God] by way of attraction (jidhba,) not by way of the soul (nafs.) This is a difference between prophets and saints. However, God has among saints the elite (safwa,) whom He chooses, so that they may become His servants and callers to God. Tomorrow (ghadan,) [i.e., on the Day of Judgement,] they will be given the priority, and they are the people who will give special praise [to God] on the Place of Standing [on the Day of Judgement] in the forefront of the rows of saints. They are the chosen of the chosen. God chose them on the way of prophets, and they proceeded to Him through attraction, they did not proceed with their own will. God drew their hearts on their way. He took them on their way Himself, and placed them between prophets

and saints. Therefore, they are so close as to be at a hearing's distance from prophets, while saints are behind them.

They are greatest in respect of attentiveness and awakfulness, and they have more insight into the way of prophets, because they [themselves] proceeded on that way as the chosen ones. They are the munfaridun, whose hearts are immersed in the unity of God (wahdanlya,) and who walked away from worldly things. They are the muhaddathun .

According to TirmidhI, the messengers, the prophets, and the muhaddathun belong to the same category of the mursalun (the God-sent.) He seems to have gotten a hint for the above idea from Ibn c Abbas's reading of the Qur'anic verse (/), "We have never sent any messenger nor any prophet before you but that Satan interferred with his desire even while he desired some thing." Ibn c Abbas transmitted' a variant reading which inserts "nor any muhaddath" after "nor any prophet." Both saints and prophets are not sent to the creatures with a particular law; still they are sent by God.

Everyone whose affair God (Himself) administers (waliya,) everyone whom God commissions (istana'a) and singles out is a "sent one" (mursal) and a "dispatched one" (mab'uth.) Don't you see what God mentioned concerning the enemies of the Israelites whom He prepared as a punishment for His servants?

He said, "Then We sent against you our servants of mighty powers." Although this is a dispatch (ba c th) for the evil and punishment, they [i.e., muhaddathun] are dispatched for the good and help (ghiyath .)

TirmidhI repeatedly emphasizes that prophethood consists of some certain number of parts, some of which are possessed by the saints as well. The idea of prophethood consisting of parts is taken from the following two hadlths: "veridical vision (ru'ya) of the believer is one of the forty-six parts of prophethood" and "moderation (iqtisad,) good manner (samt has an,) and right guidance (huda

salih) are among twenty-three parts of prophethood." The first hadlth is often supported by two other hadlths. Concerning the Qur'anic verse, "the friends of God do not have fear nor sorrow . . . they have the good tidings (bushra) in the life of this world and hereafter," the Prophet, according to the hadlth, explained "the good tidings" as the veridical vision (ru'ya saliha) which the servant or God sees or which appears to him. And in the other hadith he explains the vision of the believer as the speech (kalam) which the Lord utters to His servant in his dream.

In the Asrar al-Ma'rifa, Tirmidhi in fact enumerates all the forty-six parts of prophethood. According to this list, hadith is the noblest part of prophethood, then follows siddiqlyah, ilham, and firasa .

As can be seen from the discussion above, hadith is the greatest part of prophethood. In the Nawadir al-Usul, Tirmidhi writes as follows:

When the intellects (z uqul) of the muhaddathun become pure and their hearts clean, unblemished by sins, desires, and worldly attachments (tala'iq,) they are spoken to (kullimu) upon their hearts. Since the speech (kalam) upon spirits (arwah) while asleep is one of the forty-six parts of prophethood, speech upon hearts while awake is more than one-third of prophethood, [varying] in accordance with their proximity to their Lord in their sittings (majails.)

Thus, muhaddathun who possess hadith possess one-third or even more of prophethood, according to their varying degree.

For the muhaddathun there are [different] stations (manazil.) Some of them are given one-third of prophethood, some a half of it, and some even more.

Then what is hadith, and how is it different from the prophetic revelation and the inspiration of the saint? As is seen in the above

quotation from the *Nawadir al-Usul*, it is the speech of God falling upon the heart while awake. The term *muhaddathun* is, of course, taken from the famous hadith concerning c Umar. In the hadith, the Prophet says: "there were in the [previous communities] *muhaddathun*; if there is [such] in my community, it is c Umar Ibn al-Khattab." Another variant of this hadith shows the meaning of *muhaddathun* more clearly.

It runs as follows: "there were in the [previous] communities people who were spoken to [by God] besides the prophets; if there is such a one in my community, it is c Umar Ibn al-Khattab."

Although usually hadlth scholars interpret the term *muhaddathun* in the above hadlth as those who receive inspiration (*ilham*), Tirmidhi distinguishes *Ilham* and hadlth. In a rather obscure passage of the *Asrar al-Ma c rifa*, he says:

The beginning of hadlth is *ilham* a new (tarly) hadlth comes from God to His saint without the witness of the angels from one to one. The action of hadlth is the presence (*hudur*) of the heart . . . Hadlth is [a part] of prophethood, just as audition (*sam<*) is one of the aspects of the heirs of prophethood.

Also in the *Tahsll Haz'a'ir al-Qur'an*, Tirmidhi distinguishes messengership, prophethood, hadlth and *ilham* in the following manner:

The revelation (*wahy*) which His speech (*kalam*) warrants (*damina*) is messengership; the revelation which prophethood warrants is prophethood; the revelation which His knowledge (c *ilm*) warrants is hadlth; the revelation which wisdom (*hikma*) warrants is *ilham* .

Although it is very clear that hadith which only those chosen by God can receive is higher than *ilham* unfortunately it is not very clear how they are different and where the difference lies. For instance, in the following passage in which the manner of the revelation for the saint is

described, ilham and firasa appear together with saklna which distinguishes hadith.

The good tidings (bushra) [i.e., the verdical vision] comes to his [believer's] heart while awake. Indeed, the heart is the treasury of God. His spirit (ruh) leaves (his body) to God in his sleep, and prostrates itself to Him below the Throne. On the other hand, his heart goes to Him beyond the Throne inside the Veils, beholds the sittings (majails,) converses [with Him] intimately (yunajl,) and is given the good tidings. And in it are his tawhld, his ilham, his firasa, and his saklna .

On the other hand, the difference between hadlth and the prophetic revelation (wahy) is discussed at great length. However, it must be noted that sometimes the term wahy is used generically for all forms of revelation as in the passage quoted above from the Tahsll Naza'ir al-Qur'an. Also the term muhaddath is sometimes used generically for every receiver of the revelation, as in the following passage from the Nawadir al-Usitl:

The muhaddath is of three kinds: the muhaddath with wahy, which is that which goes down (yakhfiq) upon the heart through the Spirit; muhaddath in sleep is concerned with spirits which, when they go out from the body, they are spoken to; muhaddath while awake upon the heart with the saklna, and they comprehend it (ya z qiluhu) and know it.

In the above quotation, the first type of muhaddath corresponds to the prophet, because TirmidhI repeatedly states that the prophet receives wahy through the spirit, while the muhaddath receives hadlth with the saklna .

The difference between prophethood and sainthood (here the muhaddathun) is explained in the Khatm al~Awliya' in the following way:

Prophethood is the speech (kalam) which comes (yanfasil) from God as revelation (wahy,) together with a spirit (ruh) from God, so that the revelation is decreed (yuqtada) and sealed with the spirit. And through it [i.e., spirit,] it [i.e., the revelation] is accepted. This is what necessitates the belief (tasdlq) in it. Those who deny it become infidels, because they deny the speech of God. On the other hand, sainthood is for those to whom God entrusted (waliya) His hadlth. He [God] carries him [the saint] to Himself in a different way, and he has the hadlth. This hadlth comes (yanfasil) from God on the tongue of the Truth (c ala lisan al-Haqq,) together with the saklna. The saklna which is in the heart of the muhaddath receives it [i.e., hadlth,] accepts it, and has peace of mind in it (yaskun ilayhi,)

Then he further explains the difference between hadlth and kalam in the following way:

Hadlth is what appears from His knowledge when He wills it.

This is the hadlth of the soul, like a secret. This hadlth happens only from God's Love toward this servant of His. It progresses, together with truth, to his heart, and the heart receives it through saklna, and whoever denies this . does not become an unbeliever, rather he is frustrated, and evil consequences befall him, and his heart falters, because this man denies the truth brought by God's Love from God's knowledge of Himself. For He entrusted him with the truth, and made it a buttress for his heart. Whereas the former the who denies the prophet] denies God's word (kalam) and revelation (wahy) and spirit (ruh) to His face.

Although prophethood and sainthood, that is, wahy and hadlth are well distinguished terminologically, still one wonders whether the distinction is really anything more than the difference of terminology.

Just as prophethood is from God, so is the hadlth from God

according to the aspects which I mentioned to you. And just as prophethood is guarded (mahrusa) by the revelation and the spirit, so is the hadlth guarded by the Truth and the saklna. The revelation brings prophethood, and the spirit is its partner (qarln.) The truth brings the hadlth, and the saklna is the premise (muqaddama) of prophethood, and the hadlth is in the heart of the prophet and the muhaddath is fixed (thabit.) s

Both the prophet and the muhaddath are divinely guarded by God from any mistakes, and the revelation and fradlth are infallible. Although it is very clear that prophethood is higher than hadlth, still we do not know exactly in which points the former is superior.

Tirmidhi also distinguishes the messenger from the prophet and the saint (muhaddath.) Messengership is most clearly defined, because here Tirmidhi follows the concept of messengership generally accepted in Islam. The messenger is the one who is given by God the message (risala,) that is, the Law (sharl c a.)

The messenger is the one who prophesies (yatanabba') and is sent to the people whom he informs (yukhbir,) and to whom he brings the message (risala.) The prophet is the one who prophesies, but he is not sent to anyone. When he is asked, he informs them, and meanwhile he calls the people to God, exhorts them, and shows them the way in the Law of the messenger. The messenger possesses the Law, which he brought from God, and he calls the people to that Law. The prophet is the one who is not sent [to anyone,] He follows the Law of that messenger, and calls the people to that Law which the messenger brought, shows it to them. Also the muhaddath does in the same manner; he calls the people to God on the basis of the way of that Law, and shows them the way to it . . . God took a covenant (mlthaq) from every one of them [i.e., the messenger, the prophet, and the muhaddath,] each separately; the covenant of the messenger with his messengership; the covenant of the prophet with his prophethood; the covenant of

the muhaddath with his sainthood (walaya.) All of them call the people to God. However, the messenger is decreed the fulfilment (ada') of messengership with the Law; the prophet is decreed information (khabar) about God. Those who disapprove of them are infidels. The muhaddath has the hadlth with the confirmation (ta'yld) and the additional clear proof (ziyada bayyina) in the Law of the prophet . . . Whoever disapproves of him fails for lack of His blessing (baraka) and His light.

Both the prophet and the muhaddath follow the Law of the messenger. Therefore, the hadlth which the muhaddath receives from God is never contradictory to the Law, but always agrees with the Law and confirms it. If it contradicts the Law, it is not hadlth, but insinuation (waswas) which comes from the Devil. Since the muhaddath is divinely guarded from the devil, such a man who contradicts the Law cannot be a muhaddath.

What comes to him [i.e., the muhaddath] upon the tongue of the Truth in God is good tidings, confirmation (ta'yld,) and exhortation (maw'iza.) It does not abrogate anything of the Law, rather it is in agreement with the Law. What contradicts the Law is devilish insinuation (waswas.)

As we have seen above, TirmidhI always clearly places messengers and prophets in front of saints. Although there are degrees among the prophets, even the highest saint cannot reach the rank of the lowest prophet. Nevertheless, he is often accused of positing the supremacy of saints over prophets by contemporaries and later scholars. As Geyoushi, Baraka, and Radtke all pointed out, the accusation is unfounded in his extant writings. However, as we have seen above, there is also no apparently qualitative difference between hadlth and prophethood beyond the sophisticated terminology. In other words, they are not different in kind. At least, the content of these two types of revelation is not analyzed carefully and in any detail. Curiously, prophethood is very often analyzed quantitatively. We can even say that muhaddathun

are less of prophets, and prophets more of saints. Also it is interesting to note that TirmidhI never explicitly states that every prophet, every messenger is at the same time a saint. However, this should be the logical conclusion of his following statement:

The muhaddath has hadith, firasa, ilham, and siddlqlya. The prophet, in addition to all the above, has prophethood (tanabbu'). The messenger has, in addition to all the above, messengership. The saints below them have firasa, ilham, and siddlqiya. *

In one place, TirmidhI seems to suggest that the saints are nearer to God than the prophets, quoting the hadith, "God has servants (z ibad) who are neither prophets nor martyrs, but whom both prophets and martyrs envy, because of their place (makan) and their proximity to God ..." However, TirmidhI is asked whether this hadith does not show the superiority of saints over prophets, he emphatically denies it, saying, "there is absolutely no one who is superior to the prophets by virtue of their prophethood and their position (mahall.)" When he is further asked why the prophets envy them, if they are not superior to them, he answers as follows: "He (Muhammad) has explained it already in the hadith; it is because of their proximity and their place (makan) in relation to God." Here, although the superiority of the prophets over the saints is explicitly affirmed, still it is suggested that saints are nearer to God than prophets. However, this fact is never emphasized. In this connection, it is worthy to note that TirmidhI never mentions that the messenger is given the Law through the intermediacy of angels, while he emphasizes many times that the saint has intimate conversations with God face to face, nor does he refer to the story of Khadir and Moses to prove the supremacy of saintly gnosis over prophetic knowledge.

In one passage in the Khatm al-Awliya', he describes the station (maqam) and the lot (hazz) of the Messenger in the following way.

The station of the Messenger is in the Kingdom of the Kingdom in front of Him; and his lot of it is His wahdanlya .

We have already seen that both "the Kingdom of the Kingdom in front of Him" and wahdanlya are attributed to the saint also. However, Tirmidhi is not comparing here the messenger with the saint. Therefore it is not his intention to equate the messenger with the saint. We can explain his inconsistency in the following manner. When he describes the saint, the prophet, and the messenger separately, he tends to extol each of them with the highest laudatory expressions. Thus their descriptions sometimes coincide. However, when he compares them consciously, he is careful to distinguish them, using different terms for each of them, and to place the messenger in the highest rank, then the prophet, and then the saint.

Next, I would like to discuss briefly Tirmidhi's concept of the seal of the saints (khatm al-awliya'.) This concept invented by him has exercised a profound and enduring influence upon later Sufism. We have already pointed out the characteristic parallelism between prophethood and sainthood in Tirmidhi's thought. It is this parallelism which led him to invent the concept of the "seal of the saints" as counterpart to the seal of the prophets. The parallelism between the seal of the prophets and the seal of the saints is worked out very carefully and in detail. The seal of the saints will appear physically at the Last Judgement as the last saint, just as Muhammad appeared the last among the prophets. In this sense, he is identical with the Mahdi. However, the seal of the saints as the idea in the mind of God is the first of the saints in His divine plan, just as Muhammad is the first of the prophets. This interesting doctrine of the pre-existence of Muhammad is expressed in terms of vague, liturgical encomium rather than in terms of the metaphysical doctrine of later Sufism and the cosmological myth of Shi'ism. And the pre-existence of the seal of the saints is conceived as exactly parallel to that of Muhammad.

For God was, when nothing was, and then came his [creative]

Word, and Knowledge appeared, and Will. The first creative Word was Muhammad's; of Knowledge first appeared his knowledge; of Will, his will. In destinies assigned, his was the

first; on the Well-Preserved Tablet he was the first, and in the covenant he was the first.

The seal of the saints is described in the following way:

This saint [i.e., the seal of the saints] never ceases to be mentioned from the beginning. He is the first in the creative Word, the first in Knowledge, then the first in Will. He is the first in the destinies assigned, the first in the Well-Preserved Tablet, the first in the covenant.

They are also both first on the Day of Resurrection. The following is the description of Muhammad on that Day: -

He is the first on the Day when the earth is split apart. He is the first to speak (khitab,) the first to arrive (wifada,) the first to intercede, the first to come near (jiwar,) the first to enter Heaven (dukhiil al-dar,) the first to visit (ziyara.) So he leads the prophets. He is the Sealer of prophethood, he is the proof of God to His creation on the Day of Standing (yawm al-mawqif.) No other prophet can attain this [position.]

Exactly identical expressions are used for the seal of the saints.

He is the first to gather (mahshar) [on the Day of Resurrection], the first to speak,* the first to arrive, the first to intercede, the first to come near, the first to enter the Heaven, the first to visit. He is in every place the first of the saints just as Muhammad is the first of the prophets.

On the Day of Resurrection, all the saints are in need of the seal of the saints, because he is the intercessor for them, just as all the prophets are in need of Muhammad for his intercession. He is the proof of God to all the other saints, and he leads them.

The seal of the saints is described by Tirmidhi with the highest

possible attributes and, as has been pointed out before, these descriptions sometimes coincide with other saints (siddl gun, or muhaddathuh) and prophets.

His [i.e., the seal of the saints] is the highest of the stations (manazil) of the saints. He is in the Kingdom of far-danlya, and stands alone (ifarada) in His wahdanlya. His intimate conversation with God (munajatuhu) is [held] face to face (kifahan) in the sittings (majalis) of the Kingdom.

The station (maqam) of this servant [i.e., the seal of the saints] is in front of God in the Kingdom of the Kingdom. His intimate conversation with God (najwahu) is here in the Greatest Sitting (al-majlis al-a c zam.) He is in the grip of God (huffa fl qabdatihi,) x

However, when the seal of the saints is compared with other saints and the prophets, he is placed carefully between these two: the prophets are in front of him, and the saints are behind him. After Tirmidhi declares that the gifts (had aya) which the seal of the saints receives come from the treasuries (khaza'in) of endeavor (sa'y,) he explains this term as follows:

There are three types of treasuries: those of graces (minan) for the saints; those of endeavor for the leader (al-imam al-qa'id); and those of the proximity (qurb) for the prophets.

The station (maqam) of this man is beyond (min) the treasuries of graces, and next to (mutanawal min) the treasuries of the proximity. He is always in endeavor. Thus his rank (martaba) is in that place; however, he has access to the treasuries of the prophets and the cover (ghita') has been uncovered for him from the station and ranks of the prophets and their gifts (c ataya) and presents (tuhaf .)

Thus he can be said to be almost like the prophets, although he is not equal to them. However, sometimes Tirmidhi places the seal of the

saints immediately after Muhammad. He is "near the ear" of Muhammad (huwa min Muhammad . . . ind a al-udhuni ,) while the saints are at

the back of his head (c inda al-qafa .) '1 God brings him on the way of Muhammad with his prophethood, and gives him the seal for his approaching the source of Muhammad on the Day of Standing.

Continuity of Sainthood

According to Tirmidhi, saints continue to appear in the dark ages of troubles after the death of Muhammad and his companions. He declares that the reign of goodness (dawlat al-khayr) and the reign of evil (dawlat al-sharr) alternate, based on the hadith, "there comes upon you no [favorable] age (zaman) except that after it comes the evil from it," and considers his time the reign of evil. How are the walaya and the siddiqiya possible in this dark age? His answer is as follows: the walaya and the siddiqiya are not related to time at all; the saint and the siddiq are the proof of God upon His creation, the succor (ghiyath) of the creation and their protection (aman,) because they are the callers to God upon clear proof.

In one place, he affirms the continuous existence of the saints after Muhammad in more concrete terms:

Now when God took His prophet, He made in his community forty siddiqiin, through whom the earth stands still. They are "the people of his House" (al baytihi.) Whenever one of them dies, God appoints another who takes his place.

It continues like that, until at the end of the world He sends the seal of the saints.

God sent the messengers in the time of slackness (fatra,) blindness, and the reign of falsehood, so that the truth be revived and falsehood be destroyed. What prevents you from thinking that there will be a man at the end of time who is equal to the first of them, because of people's need of them

at the end of time?

This supposition of Tirmidhi encounters the difficulty that, after Muhammad, Abu Bakr and c Umar are considered the greatest saints. Therefore, it is asked of him whether it is possible that there are those who are equal to Abu Bakr and c Umar in his time. Tirmidhi answers this question by distinguishing between "acts" (a' māl) and ranks (darajat.) It is impossible for the later saints to be equal to them in respect to actions, but possible in respect of ranks.

Who stingily denies the mercy of God to the people, our time, so that there can be no sabiq, no muqarrab, no mujtaba among our people? Will the mahdi not appear at the end of the world, rising with justice at the time of slackness? There is no impossibility in that.

Certainly, God does not consign people to desparation by limiting His mercy only to Abu Bakr and c Umar. Thus, Tirmidhi affirms the continuous existence of the saints until the end of the world.

Lastly I would like to bring a few additional points in Tirmidhi's theory of sainthood which show similarities to that of Ibn 'Arabi. For Tirmidhi, the knowledge which the saints possess is the clearest sign of their sainthood. It is the knowledge of the beginning (bad',) covenant (mlttiaq,) decrees (maqadlr,) letters (huruf.) And he constantly criticizes the jurists (fuqaha',) whose science does not teach anything on these matters. They even betray the spirit of the Law by employing various ruses (hiyal) to please the rulers. Sometimes he calls the jurists "the knowers of the command of God" (c ulama' amr Allah) in contrast with the saints, "the knowers of God."

The saint's constant changing of states (ahwal) and God's self-manifestation (tajalli, or zuhur) to the hearts of the saints, two characteristic doctrines of Ibn 'Arabi, are not lacking in Tirmidhi. It is said that the saints worship God by constantly changing their states, and the seal of the saints transforms himself (yataqallab) in

his state of contraction (qabda.) The soul of the saint is annihilated by the self-manifestation of God (tajalli) which comes down upon it, then their heart lives only through the Lord. However, as compared to Ibn 'Arabi, Tirmidhl's references to these are brief and isolated, and are not developed into a metaphysical doctrine.

Prophethood and Sainthood in Ghazzall's Klmiva-vi Sa c adat
Ibn 'Arabi mentions Ghazzall's *Kimiya' al-Sa'ada* in his exposition of the theory of sainthood, and thinks that Ghazzall claims in this book that prophethood can be acquired, as distinct from being conferred by God. Therefore it is necessary to examine the theory of prophethood and sainthood expounded in this book.

The well-known *Kimiya—yi Sa'adat* is a Persian summary of the *Ihya' t-Ulum al-Dln*. However, there is a much smaller book of the same title in Arabic. This Arabic work corresponds roughly to the first chapter of the Introduction (*c umran awwal*) of the Persian version Cpp. -.) Probably Ibn 'Arabi read this Arabic version. However, sometimes the authenticity of the Arabic version is doubted, while the authenticity of the Persian version is never questioned.

In the Arabic version, the problem of prophets and saints is discussed on pp. -, which correspond to pp. - of the Persian version, although the Arabic version is much abridged.

In this part, Ghazzall deals with the "mystical knowledge" ("ilm ladunni,) which the heart receives directly from the invisible world through the inner window (rawzan~i dil.) lliQ For the common man, this window is open only during sleep and after death. However, one can sometimes receive this kind of knowledge as *firasa* (insight) and *khatir* (inspiration,) in the same manner as saints receive *ilham* . The window can be also opened while one is awake, if one purifies his heart from anger, desires and bad habits through spiritual combat (jihad) and exercises (riyada.) Then one can see in waking what others see in sleep. And Ghazzall quotes the words of Muhammad, "The earth became contracted for me, and I saw the farthest east and the farthest west." Prophets acquire knowledge in this way, and so do sufis in

our time. And Ghazzall contrasts this type of knowledge with that of *ulama'.*

However, the ability to receive such mystical knowledge is not limited to prophets and saints, because it is inherent to the essence of man. This belongs to the innate human nature (*fitra*), therefore whoever purifies his heart can attain this degree (*daraja*). Then Ghazzali goes on to say that prophets and saints are also human beings, and quotes the Qur'anic verse, "Say, 'I am a man like you'". The discussion on prophetic knowledge in the Arabic version ends here, while in the Persian version, it continues, and Ghazzali discusses the difference between the prophet and the saint in the following manner:

When the way is open to a man, and what is good (*salah*) for all creatures is shown to him, and he calls [people] to that [good] which is shown to him, then that [i.e., what is shown to him] is called "the sacred Law" (*sharz at*), and he is called "prophet" (*payambar*) and his condition (*tialat*) is called "prophetic miracle" (*mu'jiza*). When one is not occupied with the calling of people, he is called "saint" (*wali*), and his conditions are called "miracles" (*karamat*). x

In the Persian version of the *Klmiya*, there is an extra section (*fasl*) which is entitled "The Reality of Prophethood and Sainthood. , Here, Ghazzali first declares that both prophethood and sainthood are among the ranks (*darajat*) of nobleness of man's heart. They have these three characteristics.

- . What is disclosed in a dream for the common people is revealed to the prophet and the saint while awake.
- . While the soul of the common people only affects their own body, the soul of the prophet and the saint affects bodies outside their own in a manner beneficial to the creature (i.e., they can work miracles.)

. While the common people obtain knowledge through instruction, the prophet and the saint obtain it without education from their inner self through the purification of their soul. Such knowledge is called "mystical knowledge" (*cilm ladunnl.*)

Whoever unites all the above three qualities is one of the prophets or the saints. There are different ranks among them: some possess only one of the three qualities; some possess a little of all the three. The one who possesses the three qualities to the most perfect degree is the Prophet Muhammad. The common people are given samples for all these qualities, so that they can understand what prophethood is like, and follow the Prophet, and learn from him. These samples are dream, *firasa*, and *khatir*.

Ghazzall does not deny the possibility that there exist some other qualities among prophets and saints which do not correspond to those found in the common people. But these qualities are, even if they exist, unknowable by definition. In this sense, it can be said that God can be only known by God, the prophet by the prophet and those higher than the prophet, the saint by the saint and those higher than the saint.

Except for the reservations of agnosticism characteristic of Ghazzali, he considers prophethood and sainthood the highest capacity of the heart. Although everyone is endowed with a part of this capacity, it is more developed in the prophet and the saint, and it is most perfectly realized in the Prophet Muhammad.

The "mystic knowledge" of sufi saints and the knowledge of prophets have a common source, although the latter is concerned with the wellbeing (*salah*) of the whole creatures, that is, the sacred Law, and they call people to it. Ghazzall does not state explicitly that prophethood can be acquired, nor does he deny this possibility categorically.

Before comparing Ibn 'ArabI's theory of sainthood to that of TirmidhI and Ghazzall discussed above, it will be helpful for an understanding of the position of Ibn 'ArabI if we first examine his early

treatise on sainthood and prophethood, in which Tirmidhi's influences can be seen most clearly.

Ibn 'Arabi's Early Theory in the Treatise on Sainthood and Prophethood
The small treatise on sainthood and prophethood, which was recently edited by Hamid Tahir, was written by Ibn 'Arabi at a relatively early age before his departure to the East. Therefore, by comparing the thought expressed in this, treatise to that in *al-Futuhat al-Hakka* and the *Fusus al-Hikam*, we can trace his development on the subject of sainthood and prophethood.

The leitmotif of this treatise is the daring words of Mahdawi, "the knowers ('ulama') of this community are prophets of other communities."

The treatise is written for Ibn 'Arabi's cousin, who studies Sufism under Mahdawi, to explain this enigmatic saying of the shaykh.

At the beginning of the treatise, he affirms that there are continuous revelations from God. Although the expressions ('ibarat) used in them are different, they are essentially various aspects of one Truth.

Have you not seen the Tura, the Injil, and other revealed Books ? Just as one book of them was not enough, so God [continues] to inspire (alhamma) the saints. Maybe God reveals (yaftah) to one person something other than what is revealed to another person. Rather this is the only conceivable explanation. However, some revelations (futuh) are more perfect than others. If this were not the case, and if everyone of those who proceed along the way of God and arrive at the Truth itself ('ayn al-haqqa) had a revelation (fath) which is specially his and impossible to attain for others, then people would not understand each other, and any ignorant one could stand up and utter nonsensical words and claim them to be inspiration from God which cannot be denied, since there is no proof (burhan) for intuitive knowledge (dhawq,) nor is there any evidence (dallil) for revelation.

Of course, here Ibn 'Arabi is not demanding logical proof for revealed knowledge, rather he is asserting that there is no real disagreement among the saints, but only a difference of degrees of knowledge attained and in manners of expression. Those to whom only a partial knowledge is revealed may disagree with those who attain the higher knowledge. But the possessors of the highest knowledge understand each other and also understand those who are below them, and thus there is no disagreement among them.

Then Ibn 'Arabi raises the fundamental question as to the possibility of revelation after Muhammad, and answers in the following manner.

Even if Gabriel ceases to come, inspiration (ilham) does not cease to come upon the breasts of the saints. Yes! God inspires His saints with His secrets and informs the heaven of their hearts with the suns and the moons of his knowledge.

The knowledge gushing forth from Him (mawarid) does not have any limit nor end ... It is the oceans which do not have shores . . .

Then he quotes the hadith, "the knowers (ulama') are the heirs of the prophets," and explains it in the following manner.

Only the one who is closest to a person in terms of kinship (rahiman) and affinity (nasakan) becomes his heir. Since the knowers were the closest to the prophets in terms of affinity, they became heirs to the prophets in respect of "condition"

(hal,) "action" (fi al-) "saying" (qawl,) and "knowledge"

(ilm,) both outwardly (zahiran) and inwardly (batinan.)

The heirs of the prophets have highest honor and elevation in high ranks . . .

After this introduction, he starts to interpret the saying of Mahdawl, "the knowers of this community are prophets of other communities ."

He [Mahdawl] thereby exhorts the people to learn and to be guided and to be led to the straight path; and [he exhorts] the masses to cleave to knowledge (al~ z ilm,) lest ignorance prevail over them and they go astray; for if knowledge had departed after the death of the Prophet, people would have gone astray.

Ibn 'Arabi classifies the knowledge into three categories: that which is related to this world; to the Next world; .and to God. The prophets are those who united all the above categories of knowledge, and so do the knowers who are the heirs of the prophets.

Thus the knowers preserve the total knowledge of the Prophet after his death, because mankind is always in need of his knowledge.

You say: Even if the person of the Prophet (shakhs al-nabl) and his vision (vu'ya) were lost, his Law and his sunna were not lost. Rather, God placed them in the treasuries of the breasts of the knowers who are his heirs. When a seeker knocks at the doors of these treasuries with his question, these doors are opened.

In this way knowers imitate the prophet and perform the same function as the prophet. However, as followers and imitators of him, they can never reach the degree of prophethood (daraja al-nubuwa) as the Prophet himself said, "there is no prophet after me."

The last step the saint takes is the first step the prophet takes; the beginning of the prophets is the end of siddlqun and the saints.

The superiority of prophets over saints is explicitly mentioned in this treatise. However, it is always followed by a reservation. "In this there is a subtle secret which cannot be disclosed." Although

this mystery is not disclosed in the entire treatise, it must be the equality of sainthood and prophethood in the inner sense. This equality is implicitly suggested through the strange etymological explanation of the meaning of nabl. He proposes two possible roots for this term: nb' (to inform) and nbw (to raise.) In the case of the former root, the form fa'll can have both the meanings of the active participle (fa'il) and the passive participle (maf'iil,) i.e., the term nabl means "the one who is informed [by God]" and "the one who [in turn] informs people." This meaning can equally apply to the saints, because they are also informed through inspiration (ilham,) and they in turn inform the people. However, their information does not concern the renewal or cancellation of the sacred Law, i.e., they are not messengers. It is for this reason that Mahdawl used the term "prophets" (anbiya') instead of "messengers" (rusul) in his saying, "the knowers of this community are prophets of other communities."

In the case of the second root, it has the meaning of the passive participle, i.e., the term nabl means "the one who is raised (by God.)" This meaning also applies to the knowers, because it is said in the Qur'an, "God raises those who believe among you and those who possess knowledge (.)

The active participle, i.e., "the one who informs the people" is more appropriate to the messenger (mursal) than to the prophet who is not a messenger and the saint who is his heir (al-wall al-warith,) while the passive participle of both roots is more appropriate to the saint and the prophet who is not the messenger. However, there is a difference between the two: God informs the prophet through the intermediacy of the angel, and the saint through direct inspiration. Then Ibn 'Arabi refers to the story of Khadir and Moses, quoting the former's words in the Qur'an: "You will never have any patience with me. How can you show any patience with something that is beyond your experience?" (.) These words of Khadir to Moses clearly show that the station of the prophets and that of the saints are different. However, at this point, Ibn 'Arabi abruptly stops the explanation, saying that here is a secret which will shake the Throne, if it is forcibly divulged.

Then Ibn 'Arabi asserts the infallibility (t-isma) of the saints' knowledge, because they are divinely protected from snares and tricks of the devil. The knowers of this community are also infallible. The first of them are the companions (satiaba) of the Prophet, then the followers (tabi'un) of the companions, then the followers of the followers and so on. And Ibn 'Arabi mentions Abu Bakr and c Umar as the foremost examples of the knowers of this community. Especially c Umar is one of the muhaddathiin, and he refers to a miraculous event in the life of c Umar. While he was in Medina, he shouted to an expedition marching in Iraq, warning them against the danger near a mountain. And all the soldiers could clearly hear the warning of c Umar. Strangely enough, Ibn 'Arabi shifts the emphasis from c Umar to the soldiers in the above event. Their miraculous audition itself is the beginning of mystical knowledge (mukashafat) for the common people.

Ibn 'Arabi affirms that everyone potentially has the mystical power inside him by means of which he can traverse from the east to the west in a wink, and even burn the world. The sample of this power for the common people is experienced in dreams. While one is in bed, one can see oneself sometimes in the highest place, sometimes in the east, sometimes in the west. However, some people can perceive while awake what

other people perceive in a veridical dream. They are the abdal mentioned in the hadlth, "The earth became contracted for me, and I saw the farthest east and the farthest west of the earth; the abdal of my community will attain [that state in which] the earth contracted for me."

Then Ibn 'Arabi divides the knowers (c ulama') in respect of "arrival (at God)" (wusul): those who do not return, and those who return. The latter is further divided into two classes: the particular return (ruju c khusus) and the general return (ruju c c umiim,) The first is called t-arif, the second the knower C'-alim) who is the heir (warith.)

When many think the *-arif to be higher than the knower, they mean by the knower the possessor of the knowledge of legal judgements (sahib c ilm al-ahkam.) However, Ibn 'Arabi supports Mahdawi's opinion that

the c arif is between the knower of God and the knower of legal judgements. Then he quotes the famous hadith in which the Prophet said, "Prophethood has ceased. There is no messenger nor prophet after me." When this grieved the people, he added, "but there are still good tidings (mubashshirat.)" When he was asked about the meaning of "good tidings," he said, "the vision (ru'ya) of the believer is a part of prophethood." Therefore the Sufis can attain a part of prophethood.

However, Mahdawi did not say "the prophets of this community . . . ,"

rather he said "the knowers of this community . . .", thus conforming with the words of the Prophet, "the knowers are the heirs of the prophets .

When Mahdawi saw the similarity between the Sufis and the prophets who are not messengers, he said, "the knowers of this community are the prophets of other communities." The similarity lies in two aspects: the aspect of "knowledge" (cilm) and the aspect of "station" (maqam.)

Therefore, the above words of Mahdawi should not be interpreted as the total identification of the Sufis and the prophets.

The Arabs compare one thing to another in any one aspect, even if they are different in the rest of the aspects. We say,

"Zayd is lion in respect of power; Zayd is Zubayr in respect of poetry." However, the thing which is compared to something is not superior to the power of that thing to which it is compared. When we describe Zayd, we do not compare him with the lion nor with Zubayr, rather we say, "Zayd is fierce, or Zayd is beautiful in respect of poetry," because the similarity occurs only through fierceness and poetry. However, even if we name the one with the name of the other, we are not entirely wrong, but [in that case it must be understood] with the proper context (qarlna) and with reservation (taqyid,) y In same manner one can say that Sufis are prophets in respect of knowledge, because the similarity lies in knowledge, although the knowledge

of Sufis is not equal to that of prophets. Also in the same manner, one can say that the ascetic (zahid,) the pious (wari the one who trusts in God (mutawakkil) are Sufis, because the Sufi is the one who unites all these stations in addition to the "divine uncovering" (kashf ilahl,) "divine mystery" (sirr rabbani,) and "heavenly character" (takhalluq sama'l.) Then Ibn 'Arabi continues as follows:

The relation of the Sufi to the prophet is the same as the relation of the ascetic to the Sufi. The good deeds of the pious are the evil deeds of the muqarrabun. The end of the siddiqun is the beginning of the Sufis; the end of the Sufis is the beginning of the prophets; the end of the prophets is the beginning of the messengers. The end of the messengers is the first attribute of the Divine Presence (hadra ilahTya.)

As for the similarity of the "station," it is said that both the prophets and the knowers follow the messenger, and they live in accordance with their Law. Both Aaron and Joshua are prophets, and still they follow Moses, the messenger.

In the same manner, the knowers of this community [follow the Prophet!; they are the model (qudwa,) and they are the trustees (umana') and vicegerents (khulafa') of the Prophet over his community after him, just like Aaron over the people of Moses .

The rest of this treatise does not directly deal with the problem of sainthood and prophethood. However, one of the subjects discussed in the latter part of this treatise is the interpretation of Abu Madyan's saying, "one of the signs of the veracity (sidq) of 'the aspirant to the Way' (murid) in the beginning of his aspiration is his escape from the creation. One of the signs of his escape from the creation is his presence to God . . . , Ibn 'Arabi explains this saying, taking examples from the life of the Prophet, because the Prophet is the model of the Sufis, and they imitate him. However, their "presence to God"

(wujud -Haqq) is different from the prophets' presence to God, because the latter is the presence of prophethood. Then Ibn 'Arabi warns the reader not to confuse sainthood with prophethood.

Be careful not to be confused here like those who have been confused by the Klmiya' al-Sa'ada and say that this shaykh talks about the acquisition (iktisab) of prophethood. God forbid!

In this way, the unattainability of prophethood is strongly affirmed. However, as is typical of his style, Ibn 'Arabi immediately changes the tone. What is explained above is the explanation of the outward inheritance of prophethood. "As for the inward inheritance, it is not your nest, therefore go away!," because the inward inheritance is only accessible to the chosen ones of God (murad,) not for those who aspire to God of their own will (murid.)

It must be noted that in the above treatise, there is no mention of the distinction between general prophethood and legislative prophethood, which is characteristic of Ibn 'Arabi. And in many points, the theory of sainthood in this treatise is close to that of Tirmidhi. The wahy (revelation) of the prophet and the ilham (inspiration) of the saints are clearly distinguished. Although the prophetic revelation ceased after Muhammad, inspiration from God acting upon the saints never ceases. The knowledge the saints receive from God is infallible, like the knowledge of the prophets, because the saints are protected by God from error. However, their knowledge is not concerned with the Law, therefore the former never abrogates the latter. The saints are explicitly said to be inferior to the prophets, and the prophets to the messengers, however, saints are similar to prophets in knowledge and station, because both follow the Law of the messengers. The saints can attain a part of prophethood, or rather sainthood is a part of prophethood. The prophet has all the characteristics of the saint in addition to his special characteristics. Besides these essential doctrines, Ibn 'Arabi also uses the terminology used by Tirmidhi and quotes the hadith quoted by the latter. Like Tirmidhi, Ibn 'Arabi mentions Abu Bakr and Umar as the foremost examples of the saints.

However, there are also notable differences. While analyzing the etymology of nabl, he suggests that this term is applicable also to the saints, although he does not actually apply it. Secondly, Tirmidhi's characteristic distinction between muhaddath and siddiq, hadlth and ilham is not found in this treatise. Also his distinction between the ahl al-jibaya and the ahl al-hidaya is only hinted at briefly by the terms murad and murid.

Ibn 'Arabi and Tirmidhi

Ibn 'Arabi's theory of sainthood differs from that of Tirmidhi in the following main points:

- . Ibn 'Arabi divides prophethood into the special, legislative and the general, absolute, and the latter is attributed also to the saints, while the former is only applied to the messengers.
- . In the Prophet, his sainthood is higher than his prophethood and messengership.

As mentioned before, these two characteristic doctrines are absent from his early treatise examined above. As for the first point, we have pointed out that Tirmidhi always distinguishes explicitly "the messenger," "the prophet," and "the saint." While the difference between the messenger and the other two is clear, the former being the bringer of the Law, the latter the followers of the Law, the cognitive difference between the prophet without law and the saint is not clear. Also in the early treatise of Ibn 'Arabi, he affirms the superiority of the prophets without law over the saints, although he recognizes the similarity between them in knowledge and station.

Once the principle of continuous revelation from God is accepted, it is difficult to maintain the distinction between prophets and saints. However, Tirmidhi and the early Ibn 'Arabi hesitate to apply the term "prophet" to the saints tout court, because in the Qur'an Muhammad is

called "the seal of the prophets," and in the hadlth he declares clearly that there is no prophet after him. To apply the term "prophet" to the saints infringes on the uniqueness of Muhammad and the finality of his Law. This dilemma is partly due to the fact that in the Qur'an and the hadlth, messengers and prophets are generally not distinguished. Therefore once the messenger is defined as the receiver of the law and the prophet as the receiver of the general revelation without any specific law, it is necessary to establish the category, "the prophet with legislation," which is in reality identical with the messenger, to accomodate the indiscriminate use of "messenger" and "prophet" in the Qur'an and the hadlth. Then, it is easy to interpret "the seal-of the prophets" in the Qur'an and "there is no prophet after me" in the hadith as referring to the prophet with legislation. In other words, what came to an end with Muhammad is prophethood with leg

islation, that is, messengership, and not prophethood without legislation. To affirm the uniqueness of Muhammad and the finality of his Law is one thing, and to call the saint "prophet" is another. Certainly, the saints are inferior to the Prophet, but are they really inferior to all other prophets before him? The Qur'an says, 'We preferred some prophets over others' (,) and the Prophet himself said, "the knowers of my community are the prophets of the Israelites." This saying of Muhammad is interpreted as referring to the general prophethood of which the saints can have their share. In this way, the ambiguous term "prophethood" is divided into the special, legislative prophethood which came to an end with Muhammad and the general, absolute prophethood which continues to the Day of Resurrection, because there is no end of divine instruction for mankind.

I have already pointed out that this new doctrine of Ibn 'Arabi does not endanger the uniqueness of Muhammad. On the contrary, Muhammad is elevated to a position that the orthodox *ulama'* never imagined. He is not only the last and most perfect messenger, but also the most perfect saint. The finality of the Muhammadan Law is also firmly guaranteed.

The revelations the saints receive only confirm the Qur'an and disclose its deeper meanings. And also the saints after Muhammad follow his

Law. These points are again and again emphasized by Tirmidhi, and Ibn 'Arabi's new doctrine is not to challenge them. In fact, he repeats them with the same emphasis as Tirmidhi.

As for the superiority of sainthood over prophethood and messenger-ship within the person of Muhammad, it is expressed by Ibn 'Arabi in a highly circumspect manner. When he states it, he emphasizes that it should not be taken as the superiority of saints over prophets and messengers. It is a comparison within one person. For the saints without the law are obviously inferior to the prophets with both sainthood and the law, that is, the messengers. Even when he compares sainthood, prophethood, and messengership as such, he places sainthood below prophethood and messengership, as does Tirmidhi. However, Ibn 'Arabi sometimes hints at the superiority of saints over messengers in two respects. The first is the story of Khadir and Moses in the Qur'an, and the second is the intermediacy of angels for the messenger as compared to direct revelations to the saint. But whenever these points are mentioned by Ibn 'Arabi, his language becomes obscure, and the superiority of saints over messengers is never explicitly stated. Nevertheless, it must be noted that even this kind of "hint" is not found in Tirmidhi.

So far we have not discussed Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of the seal of sainthood, therefore it is necessary here to deal with this doctrine briefly. Basically, Ibn 'Arabi follows Tirmidhi in his concept of the seal of sainthood. In the *Fusus al-Hikam*, the seal of sainthood is pre-existent in the same manner as the seal of messengership, Muhammad, is pre-existent. All the saints receive their knowledge through him. In *al-Futuhat al-Makkhya*, Ibn 'Arabi distinguishes two seals of sainthood: the seal of Muhammadan sainthood and the seal of general sainthood. The latter is Jesus, who comes at the end of the world as the mahdi. When he comes, he comes not as a prophet, but as a saint who follows the Law of Muhammad. He is the last of the saints, and after him there will be no saint. This seal of general sainthood corresponds exactly to Tirmidhi's concept of the seal of the saints, although Tirmidhi never explicitly identifies him with Jesus.

The concept of the seal of Muhammadan sainthood is more vague. The

Muhammadan saints are those who follow "the heart" of Muhammad.

Although he does not explicitly say so, they are the afrad discussed above. This seal exists in Ibn 'Arabi's time. And after him, there is no saint who follows "the heart" of Muhammad. Sometimes Ibn 'Arabi claims that he himself is that seal. Sometimes he says that he met this seal in Fez, although he does not disclose his name.

In both Tirmidhi and Ibn 'Arabi, the saints are contrasted with the conventional religious scholars (*c ulama' al-rusum*,) especially jurists. The continuous revelation from God, and the spiritual interpretation of the Qur'an and the Law through direct inner experience are

opposed to the rigid literalism of the orthodox *c ulama'*. In this respect, theory of sainthood in Tirmidhi and Ibn 'Arabi has much in common with the theory of the Imamate in Shi'ism. According to the latter, the Prophet is given both the outward (*zahir*) knowledge, that is, the Qur'an and the Law, and the inward (*batin*) knowledge, that is, the interpretation (*ta'wīl*) of the Law. Although the revelation of the outward knowledge came to an end with Muhammad, the inward knowledge

which is indispensable for the correct understanding of the Law is continuously revealed by God to the Imams. The knowledge which the Imams

possess is infallible. Thus both the doctrine of sainthood in Ibn 'Arabi and Tirmidhi and the doctrine of the Imamate in Shi'ism emphasize the continuous divine revelation after Muhammad, which teaches the inner meanings of the Law, without denying the superiority and uniqueness of Muhammad and the finality of his Law. However, in Shi'ism this

revelation is limited to the Imams, who are direct descendants of Ali and Fatima, while in Tirmidhi and in Ibn 'Arabi, the possibility of receiving divine revelations is open to everybody. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the *abdāl* are called by Tirmidhi "the people of the house," and it is said that this term should not be interpreted as referring to blood relationship . For Ibn 'Arabi, the saints are the only true heirs of the Prophet.

While Tirmidhi distinguishes the saints who are chosen by God and those who approach God with great efforts, Ibn 'Arabi does not draw the line so sharply. For him, general prophethood can be acquired, while legislative prophethood cannot. The former can be acquired by supererogatory devotional acts. It is only through God's love as requital that the Sufis reach the station of proximity, as is expressed in the hadith of the qurb al-nawafil. People can receive various kinds of knowledge of God in accordance with their capacity and preparedness. As the forms in which He manifests Himself are infinite, so is there an infinite variety of saints' knowledge of God. However, only the perfect saints, the afrah who follow "the heart" of Muhammad, can receive the totality of His manifestation by transforming their hearts in the same manner as the transformation of the heart of Muhammad.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

We have examined above the history of three motifs in Islamic thought. How can we distinguish Ibn 'Arabi's treatment of these motifs from those of Muslim thinkers before him? In the first place, he is most indebted to early Sufi tradition. This is most evident in the case of the first motif. It is only in Sufism that the hadith, "God created Adam in His image" is interpreted as referring to Adam created in the Image of God. In theology, in which only the transcendence of God is emphasized, this interpretation is impossible. As for the second motif, although its origin can be found in philosophy, Ibn 'Arabi's emphasis on the metaphor of man as a kingdom with its ethical implications is without doubt derived from Sufi tradition. As for the theory of sainthood, it is Hakim Tirmidhi who introduced this speculation into Islam, and here Ibn 'Arabi follows and develops the former's theory.

Within the tradition of Sufism, at first sight he is closer to the theoretical Sufism of Hakim Tirmidhi and Ghazzali, rather than the experiential, ecstatic Sufism of Hallaj and Ruzbihan Baqll Shlrazl. However, the difference between Ibn 'ArabI and the latter type of Sufism lies mainly in the manner of expression. As has been shown by our analysis in the first chapter, Ibn 'ArabI's characteristic thought, that is, equal emphasis on the immannence and the transcendence of God, and the self-manifestation of God through His attributes and Names, can be found in Hallaj and more clearly in Ruzbihan Baqll Shlrazl.

Also the identification of man and God is more strongly expressed by Hallaj and Ruzbihan Baqll than by Ghazzali.

Ghazzali oscillates between cautious agnosticism motivated by theological considerations and Sufic "monism," based on intuitive "uncovering" (kashf.) His caution to keep a distance between God and man might be one of the reasons for Ghazzali's unpopularity in later Sufism. However, the caution is necessary for him, because his style and language are not so different from those of theologians and philosophers.

If Ghazzali expressed in his clear style what Hallaj and Ruzbihan hinted at in their ambiguous, enigmatic style, he would certainly have had much trouble with conventional religious scholars.

The style Ibn 'ArabI uses is the middle way between that of Ghazzali and that of Hallaj and Ruzbihan, as has been pointed out in the Introduction. His argument is highly technical and subtle, but not as poetical as that of Hallaj and Ruzbihan Baqll. In spite of his elusive style, his position concerning the Image of God is clear: the image of God is the Divine Names and Attributes, and there is a threefold correspondence between the Image of God, the universe, and man; the transcendence of the Essence of God is strongly affirmed, but the Divine Names are immanent in the universe and man. In this last point, he is different from Ghazzali, who emphasizes repeatedly the unknowability of the Divine Names. Thus, Ibn 'ArabI was able to provide the metaphysical basis for the intuitive "uncovering" (kashf) of Hallaj and Ruzbihan Baqli, something Ghazzali was unable to do. That is why later

Sufi thinkers chose to follow Ibn 'Arabi, not Ghazzali.